

Development

From Page 13

ensuing harm to the economy would be translated into the ANC/Cosatu alliance's gain at the negotiation table.

Whatever the outcome of the process, it is South Africa and its people who lose. Negotiation means bargaining by parts of the system, for parts of the system and at the expense of other parts of the system. If no part can win outright, it seeks to prevent others from winning by making them lose, whereupon the latter retaliates in the same manner. This process translates into a lose/lose situation for the system as a whole, and that is the current state South Africa finds itself in. If lose/lose is possible, then so is win/win, but that would require a different form of interaction amongst participants in the process, ie a different game with different rules.

'Negotiation means bargaining by parts of the system, for parts of the system, at the expense of other parts of the system'

It is suggested here that neither the political, economic, nor the broader development challenges facing South Africa can be addressed through an either/or form of interaction. We need a process that focuses on what people want and not on eliminating what they don't want (which is usually the other parties). Such a process is one of interactive, participative national development planning, and should be conducted with the aid of facilitators who don't have a stake in the system short of seeing it succeed. Such a planning process would consist of formulating the properties South Africans want this society to have (politically, economically, socially, culturally, educationally, etc), and discovering/designing the means to achieve those ends.

Within such a development debate, the focus is not on opposing parties but a shared focus on the development challenges facing us all. It brings the values of all participating groups into the design process, creates commitment to a successful outcome and a co-operative form of interaction amongst the participants. Such a process need not be confined to the national level, but can proceed on all levels down to that of local communities, with horizontal

SOME people have argued that in order to reach the "right" answer, one has first to pose the right question. In the case of discussions about the future for Afrikaners in a changing South Africa it became apparent that for many, a preliminary issue had first to be resolved: which Afrikaners?

For anyone under the misapprehension that Afrikaners are an homogenous group, discussions among a host of leading Afrikaner academics, editors and politicians showed clearly that there is no single, neat definition as to who constitutes an Afrikaner.

To some it seemed that Afrikaner was synonymous with whites, to others it referred to those who cherished the Afrikaans language and culture but had no political or ideological implications. However, despite the efforts of historians and politicians on the platform — and notwithstanding lively participation from a thoughtful and critical audience — by the end of the day there was no clear consensus as to the direction for, nor the exact definition of, the Afrikaner.

This is not to suggest that the day's discussions were a failure. The questions that were raised, the answers that were suggested and even the failure to find common agreement were revealing in themselves.

In particular, the analysis of Afrikaners in the present and future by Idasa director of policy and planning, Dr Van Zyl Slabbert, and the responses to his paper by leading Afrikaans editors prompted heated debate.

Structuring his analysis around the "objective" and "subjective" reality of what it meant to be an Afrikaner, Slabbert suggested that these were changing as a result of changes in the political climate in South Africa.

He said while some Afrikaners might still

and vertical integration and co-ordination of such planning at the regional and national levels. It is not possible to outline the process in detail here, though the knowledge and expertise for conducting it is available.

The constitutional debate in South Africa is a debate about means, and is occurring around vague and implicit ends in the form of hidden agendas pertaining to the parties themselves and not to the development challenges facing the country. It is hard to imagine how the inherent conflict built into any negotiation process can be overcome until the focus of the debate is shifted to that of national development.

The notion that political parties and nations can go their own sweet way without considering their impact on others and the

insist that even to ask the question of what it meant to be an Afrikaner implied that you were not one, the reality was that changing socio-political circumstances had affected the way in which Afrikaners view themselves.

Slabbert said that the understanding of what it meant to be an Afrikaner under the P W Botha regime was very different to the

SUE VALENTINE reports on an Idasa seminar in Pretoria.

interpretation given to Afrikaner ideology and identity by De Klerk in the 1990s. A wide spectrum of Afrikaner identities existed in South Africa. On a continuum of Afrikaners ranging from exclusive to inclusive nationalism, were included those who were right-wing, racist and conservative as well as those who were liberals, radicals or even communists.

A major question, however, which could affect many Afrikaners' self-perception was, what might happen to the Afrikaner when s/he did not have exclusive control of political power?

Slabbert said he believed that all the signs showed that the centripetal forces were stronger than the centrifugal forces. There was a genuine search and desire to find unity in diversity and to recognise diversity in unity.

However, the manner in which Afrikaners abandoned their control of power was critical because it would determine what space would be created for different possible Afrikaner identities to develop in the future.

The editor of right-wing Afrikaans news-

environment, is beginning to seem pathological, and failure to develop a model of interaction based on inclusive logic can lead only to increased conflict. The formation of economic and housing forums is a clear indication that the political debate is not sufficient, yet the decisions and policies formulated on such forums have mutual implications and cannot be addressed in isolation.

Political negotiation is not our only option. Trying interactive national development planning is an idea whose time has come.

Martine Dodds is a senior researcher at the Institute for Futures Research, University of Stellenbosch.

The fac los

Efforts to
not only
host of o
by those
deserve s

volk' up to g power

the question "Afrikaner – quo vadis?"
ated debate, they also throw up a
ons, notably, what exactly is meant
emselves as Afrikaners and do they
sideration?

paper *Die Patriot*, Mr Z B du Toit, agreed that diversity among Afrikaners was healthy and important and that unanimity and conformity should not be imposed. Exclusion and division on the basis of race was unacceptable, but ethnic differences should be respected.



MULLER: emphasis on mutual respect

He argued for a complimentary relationship between those who believed in preserving ethnicity and those who advocated a multi-ethnic approach, saying that an ethnic world view was just one aspect of reality.

However, as Van Zyl Slabbert later pointed out, Du Toit was not completely consistent in his appeal for tolerance and diversity. Despite calling on "verligte" Afrikaners not to prescribe to fellow Afrikaners who advocated an exclusive Afrikaner identity, Du Toit proceeded to instruct the "verligtes" that they should not lose themselves by following leaders of other ethnic groups.

In his response to Slabbert's analysis *Vrye Weekblad* editor Max du Preez said there were two kinds of Afrikaners – those who defined themselves ethnically and



Slabbert: dissect Afrikaner "loyalty"

those who defined themselves politically.

"I am an ethnic Afrikaner," he said, adding that it was more important to encourage people to be democrats and South Africans than Afrikaners.

"Ethnic Afrikaners have nothing to fear from Africa, but there is no place for Afrikaner chauvinism in South Africa."

The assistant editor of *Rapport*, Piet Muller, said if the Afrikaner wanted to survive there were two conditions: the Afrikaans culture and language had to enjoy majority status and (white) Afrikaners should stop living in two worlds, drawing false distinctions between themselves and "Afrikaans speakers of colour".

"Brown people have played just as much a part in developing the Afrikaans language as white people," he added.

Muller said it was impossible to use racial purity or blood as a criteria for Afrikaner identity. The emphasis should be placed rather on community values and mutual respect. "The integrity of the South African population is in the interests of us all."

Attention should be given to the South African economy which was "very close to the zero mark" and the lessons of the bitter fighting in eastern Europe should be taken to heart, he said. "We dare not destroy each other, we must respect each other...we cannot toyi toyi over our political future."

During question time the temperature of the debate increased as calls were made from the audience for Afrikaner loyalty and solidarity, but – as Van Zyl Slabbert asked in response – what exactly did loyalty mean and to whom should Afrikaners be loyal?

In one particular exchange a member of the audience, with a strong Dutch accent (who said he had been a naturalised South African since the mid-1970s), called on the advocates of both "inclusive" and

"exclusive" Afrikanerdom to tolerate each other and to allow others to pursue their different ideological/political aspirations.

In response Max du Preez questioned the man's right to identify himself as an Afrikaner when clearly he was a Hollander.

"It would seem that Afrikaners are prepared to accept white Hollanders with foreign accents, but not their fellow 'brown' Afrikaners. Are we not talking about a white nationalism rather than an Afrikaner nationalism? he asked. "Why should Afrikaners have to stand together? Must all Zulus or all Tswanas stand together?"

Afrikanerdom should be a personal, untroubled reality, said Du Preez.

Speaking from the floor, a Free State farmer and ANC member, Cas Human, pleaded impassionately with the audience to face up to the "real" issues confronting South Africa rather than to waste time agonising over the role and future of the Afrikaner.

"No longer is it just a poor whites issue. The issue is our country as a whole! Some people can vote and the majority cannot. Become involved in your country and stop worrying about how *you* are going to be treated. Otherwise you will become 'waste' in the new South Africa."

The afternoon session squared up to "Options for the Afrikaner" with a politically diverse line-up of panelists who drew applause from the audience simply because they were all sharing the same platform.

The only no show was AWB leader Eugene Terre'Blanche (who had earlier confirmed he would attend). Others represented were Dr Pieter Mulder (Conservative Party), Robert van Tonder (Boerestaat Party), Prof Andries Raadt (Afrikaanse Vryheidstigting), former CP MP Koos Botha,

Piet Coetzer (National Party) and Jan van Eck (ANC).

Dealing with the alternatives that were open to Afrikaners, Pieter Mulder said federalism was a viable possibility. Powersharing had not enjoyed much success around the world. "The ANC must convince me that they will sit on the opposition benches of parliament if they lose an election. I am not yet convinced that that climate is part of South Africa yet."

He said two realities had to be acknowledged: that regions existed and that ethnicity was a significant factor. "Ethnicity is strong enough to destroy economic pacts, we must not underestimate it."

Van Tonder (remarking that Idasa seemed too nice to be a leftwing organisation!) argued that South Africa was not one country but a sub-continent comprising 14 different peoples.

He said if a party stayed away from Codesa it could not be responsible for what took place there. Similarly, Afrikaners should have boycotted the 1908 national convention where just "three Boer leaders fought in vain for their language rights".

Continuing in rousing rhetoric which drew heavily on old antagonisms between Boer and Brit, Van Tonder said there was no such thing as an Afrikaner "volk", but there was a "Boerevolk" with its own political and legislative traditions.

"We want to restore the Boer republics. We are not Afrikaners, much less South Africans, there is no such thing as South Africanism."

Thoughts on the future of the Afrikaner from both Piet Coetzer and Jan van Eck had all the elements of political parties on the campaign trail. During question time later, political point-scoring was very much the order of the day.

Coetzer said the NP was striving towards a political environment in which the Afrikaner identity "in its full diversity could manifest itself and blossom". It was not enough just to create an environment that was democratic, it should also accommodate the needs of all aspects of society.

Van Eck said if the Afrikaner wanted to play the role of liberator rather than oppressor a number of changes were neces-



ANC Afrikaners: Jan van Eck and Cas Human

sary. These included a recognition that Afrikaner fears of fellow black South Africans were the consequence of decades of "cynical propaganda". Afrikaners should also stop seeing themselves as an embattled minority confronted by an antagonistic majority.

Reminding Afrikaners of the words of D F Malan (believe in your God, in your people and in yourself), Van Eck said it was a myth that Afrikaners could enjoy cultural and religious freedom only if they were politically dominant. It was just as important for Afrikaners to free themselves from being the oppressor as it was for black South Africans to be free.

"A democracy is coming, there will be majority rule... If this is so, then go and get involved in the process so that you can influence it," he urged.



Robert van Tonder: not a South African

Closing the day's discussion, Stellenbosch University philosopher Johan Degenaar said it was very important for Afrikaners to define what the term Afrikaner meant, but that such discussions should take place also in the presence of non-Afrikaners.

He encouraged everyone to become philosophers insofar as the precise meaning of words and concepts should be negotiated and defined.

"There is unfinished business in our history. We will get nowhere if we do not address those problems. But we cannot address them in isolation... We must find a definition of Afrikaner, but we must also find out what it means to be a fully-fledged citizen in South Africa, what it means to be a whole person at this time, in this society."

Sue Valentine is media co-ordinator with Idasa.

SOUTH African history, as determined by the Christian nationalist syllabus and textbooks writers and imposed on school pupils nationwide, has long been notorious for its careful selection of themes and sheer dullness in approach.

Their version of our past, together with a similarly slanted set of criteria for proclaiming national monuments, have served to preserve and present a heavily distorted view of the history of South Africa.

BY SUE VALENTINE

For these and other reasons, the Wits University History Workshop, as part of its ongoing efforts to re-examine history from the perspective of ordinary South Africans and to begin to engage with those in the "establishment" who maintain museums and historical sites, held its 1992 convention under the theme "Myths, Monuments and Museums: new premises?".

Asked to think of a prominent South African monument, many might name the Voortrekker monument - that solid, sombre symbol outside Pretoria which preserves one very particular perspective of South African history.

But in a paper on "Monuments and the monumentalisation of myths", Francis Frescura of the University of Port Elizabeth mentioned certain historical sites which have never been recognised and of which many South Africans consequently are ignorant.

These included Sol Plaatje's home, Freedom Square in Kliptown, the burial grounds of early leaders such as Nongqawase, Bambata, Sekhukhuni, Hintsa, Nxele, Sandile, Dingiswayo, Dinizulu among others. In addition, the site of the massacre at Bulhoek in 1920, the historical settlement at Mapungubwe near Messina which dates back to 1050 AD (which today is a shooting range occupied by the SA

Gold dust or

A POPULAR venue for tourists to Johannesburg, the city of gold, is, unsurprisingly, Gold Reef City. But while the venue makes no claims to be authentic, at the same it also hosts school tours for children studying the history of gold-mining and thus does present a very vivid picture of Johannesburg in the early days.

In a discussion of the way in which Gold Reef City presents Johannesburg's history, Wits University historian Cynthia Kros says that while it is a pleasant enough place for a day, the past it presents is "insidious - not just because we historians feel it lies about