

24 May 1991

STATE PRESIDENT'S SUMMIT ON VIOLENCE AND INTIMIDATION

F VAN ZYL SLABBERT

1. South Africa is in fundamental transition away from domination, hopefully towards a democratic outcome. True, since 1974 of more than 3 dozen countries in the world. Considerable body of comparative research has developed. Although we have our own unique features, there is a great deal we can learn - particularly on how to avoid some obvious mistakes.
2. Four modes of transition have been identified. a PACT between leadership cadres; UNILATERAL IMPOSITION from above, i.e. a Coup; massive REFORM short of violence from below; violent REVOLUTION from below. South Africa has elements of all four in her midst. There are signs that a search for a transition pact as well as demands for massive reform are emerging as the dominant modes of transition.
3. We have a slim chance of developing a transitional pact that can constrain the demands for reform within manageable

limits. We have to do this against a legacy that has and is generating political demands which will outstrip economic performance for quite some time. If this gap between demand and performance continues to widen, violence and instability will threaten our transition.

4. Research shows four general outcomes to attempted transitions away from domination -

- (a) Regression to a new autocracy - most common
- (b) Stabilization short of full democracy, i.e. interim arrangements
- (c) Democratic instability - Argentina, Nicaragua
- (d) Consolidated democracy.

We hover between repression to autocracy and stabilization short of democracy. The issue of violence is crucial for making progress - that is why this type of conference and any other ones in the future have to be taken seriously.

5. When it comes to violence, the Government is as much part of the problem as any of its opponents. There are no neutral players in this game nor are there any self-evident referees or monitors. It is particularly dangerous if Government wishes to be both participant and referee. It is as dangerous for opponents of the Government to reject attempts at negotiating or bargaining ourselves out of this dilemma. That is why we have no choice but to continue to search for as non-partial a mechanism/s to monitor the

management of transition as well as violence.

I was greatly encouraged by Viljoen's awareness of this dilemma.

6. As far as conferences of this nature are concerned, I wish to offer a few observations :

(a) The more inclusive they are the more likely they are to succeed

(b) All parties suspect each other of playing politics with peace - it serves no purpose to restate these prejudices when we come to conferences of this nature. We cannot waste time with tub-thumping; moral/radical outbidding or one-upmanship;

(c) The Chairman has to protect all speakers with equal dispassion, whether they be Terreblanche or Currin.

(d) Do not accept proposals which predate negotiation, i.e. ideas such as peace secretariats, codes of conduct etc. must be the consequences of negotiations, not the conditions for it.

(e) Never foreclose the process of bargaining - Heyn's suggestion makes obvious sense.

7. Our country is a jewel of great fortune; do not let us let it slip out of our hands because of meanness of spirit and

lack of charity. I have yet to meet an organisation or interest group in our country that has no capacity to make a contribution to our transition - whether from left or right. We have to explore this capacity in the spirit of never ever giving up.