THE ROLE OF DEMOCRATIZATION IN CONFLICT RESOLUTION AND PEACE BUILDING IN SOUTHERN AFRICA: A CASE STUDY OF SOUTH AFRICA

NORTH WEST UNIVERSITY
A33641200162739C

BOITUMELO PHIRIEPA

b1099674b
LIBRARY
MAFIKENG CAMPUS
Call No.: TH 321.80968
2006 -02- 21 PHI
Acc. No.: 06 | 30368
NORTH-WEST UNIVERSITY
i 11498262

2005 NORTH WEST UNIVERSITYSUPERVISOR

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ITEM			PAGE
Abstract			i
Acknowledgements			ii
Dedication			iii
Chapter One	Introduction Background		1
	1.2	Statement of the Problem	13
	1.3	Rationale of the Study	13
	1.4	Aim of the Study	13
	1.5	Objectives of the Study	14
	1.6	Significance of the Study	14
	1.7	Hypothesis	14
	1.8	Methodology	14
	1.9	Instruments	15
	1.10	Subjects	15
	1.11	Methods of Data Collection	15
	1.12	Data Analysis	16
	1.13	Procedure	16
	1.14	Limitations	16
	1.15	Ethical consideration	17
	1.16	Definition of Concepts	17
	1.17	Theoretical Perspective	19
	1.18	Literature Review	23
Chapter Two	The Causes of conflict in South Africa		33
	2.1	Issues of Justice	34
	2.2	Rights	36
	2.3	Unmet Human Needs	36
	2.4	Identity Issues	37
	2.5	Distributional Issues	40
Chapter Three	The role of Democratisation in Conflict Resolution and Peace Building		42
	3.1	Legitimacy	42
	3.2	Consensus About the Rules of the Game	45
	3.3	Policy Restrains by the wining Political Party	46
	3.4	Poverty Eradication	47
	3.5	Ethnic or Cultural Cleavages as Constrains on Democratic Peace	49

Chapter Four	The impact of Democratisation on the Socio-Economic Development of South Africa	50
Chapter Five	Conclusions and Recommendations	56
Reference		60

ABSTRACT

The aim of the study was to investigate the role of democratisation in peace building and conflict resolution.

The findings of the study have revealed that democratisation plays a pivotal role in conflict resolution and peace building. It provides legitimacy for governments and encourages people's participation in decision-making on issues that affect their lives; democratic processes contribute to the effectiveness of the state policies and developmental strategies.

The study has also showed that democratic institutions and practices foster the governmental accountability and transparency necessary to deter national and transnational crime and corruption and encourage increased responsiveness to popular concerns. In development, they increase the likelihood that the state goals reflect broad societal concerns and that the government is sensitive to the societal environmental costs of its development policies.

By involving people in decision-making, democracy ensures mutual respect and satisfaction between the state and its citizens, and this in turn promotes peace and stability in a country.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

During the course of researching and writing this report, I have incurred innumerable debts of gratitude. I am indebted first and foremost to the various libraries in South Africa, that have allowed me to utilise their resources and services. Without exceptions their librarians have been unfailingly helpful. In particular, I'm indebted to the Staff of the North West University (Mafikeng Campus) and the Africa Institute of South Africa, for providing possible books and material to make this report a success.

I am also indebted to my supervisor, Mr. K. Ewusi, for his valuable comments and suggestions upon the earlier draft of this report.

I further wish to express my sincere gratitude to my family, especially Mrs. K. A. Phiriepa, for her support, motivation and encouragement. She has been my pillar of strength.

Finally, I owe a special thank you to the Lord Almighty for guarding me through this tormenting and challenging task.

DEDICATION

To

My beloved mother,

Kelebogile Phiriepa

CHAPTER ONE

Introduction

1.1 Background

Africa was colonized by the European powers mainly the British and the French since 1890-1960, as part of their civilizing mission. However, the wave of Asian independence in the 1940s together with the founding of the United Nations dedicated to human rights and self-rule inspired nationalist movements and provided a model for decolonization and independence all over the world. By 1950 the old colonial order seemed to have lost its force, its historical relevance. Two world wars had thoroughly discredited the European powers' claim to a civilizing mission (Bayart, 1998).

In Africa, colonial rule was losing its advocates, most of who felt that the economic benefits no longer outweighed the growing burden of administering empires. Meanwhile, a new elite was on the rise through out the colonies, made up of a privileged few who had acceded to western education and returned with technical credentials as engineers, lawyers, or accountants. This new professional class had also absorbed western political values, and could ably challenge colonial rule on its own terms. They formed political parties at continental scale- Pan Africanism under the leadership of African nationalists such Kwame Nkruma from the Gold Coast (Ghana), Samuel Akintola from Nigeria, and Jomo Kenyatta from Kenya. The Pan Africanist movement advocated wider unity of Africans to press for self-rule and to overthrow colonialism (Ojo, 1999).

The common purpose expressed in Pan Africanism was converted into direct action at national level. Each country had within its boundaries nationalist movements dedicated to equality of status and rights, to the pursuit of personal dignity, self-respect and social regeneration. As a result, in 1957, Ghana became the first African country to gain independence, followed by other African state from 1960, the year that became known as the year of Africa's independence. However, after its independence, Africa experienced administrative problems, as most of the leaders were incompetent to govern. As a result there was a prevalence of authoritarian regimes, and single party state throughout Africa, which violated and abused human rights, and subjected it masses to severe oppression. These regimes were further perpetuated by the United States and Soviet Union's support during the cold war that sought to establish spheres of influence within Africa. In pursuit of this aim these super powers were willing to reward compliant regimes with both economic and military hardware, even if, those regimes chose to act in an oppressive manner towards their domestic populations (Coleman, 1998).

Many of Africa's more authoritarian leaders such as Mobutu Sese Seko of the former republic of Zaire (Democratic Republic of the Congo) and Mohamed Siad Barre of Somalia were happy to exploit this situation to the full and to market their strategic importance in exchange for foreign support and for regime survival. The end of the cold war in the 1980's transformed the external environment in which African political systems operated, the end of Soviet interest in Africa and the collapse of Communism discredited

socialistic and static models of government. The movement away from authoritarianism and towards democracy in Eastern Europe had a spill over effect in other parts of the world that had seen the demise of undemocratic rule. By the end of the 1980's Africa's authoritarian regimes and single party states were looking increasingly anachronistic in the light of changes elsewhere in the world. International environment provided less supportive context for authoritarianism, leading to the chronic failure of economic development in most African states, which were totally reliant on international aid and donor support. Therefore, pressures to democratize were exerted both externally and internally (Bayart, 1998).

Externally a number of western governments and international financial institutions such as the World Bank (WB), International Monetary Fund (IMF), and the World Trade Organization (WTO) began to insist that development aid and investment had to be linked to political reform in Africa. Thus, aid had conditionality in a form of structural adjustment programmes (SAPs) that meant that aid had to be couple with economic reform and political plurality. The fundamental concept of conditionality was that aid and investment should be withheld from African governments, which abused human rights and denied political freedoms to their citizens until such time as these abuses were removed. This conditionality was also specifically linked to democratization and good governance (Ojo, 1999).

Domestically, there was a development of pro-democracy movements of most African states that represented a remarkable coalescence of political

participation by all levels of society from elite to mass level. At elite level, pressure came from educated groups who had managed to retain, or were able assert some degree of autonomy from state control. Church leaders were especially prominent in a good number of cases. Enjoying a high level of popular respect in highly religious African societies, church leaders also had the organizational advantages of belonging to well-established institutions. In the more highly authoritarian African states, church congregations often represented one of the few legal ways of bringing people together in large numbers: the "political sermon" became common in the transitional period. Professional associations, especially organized by lawyers, medical staff and academics, played an important role in the pressure for political reform.

Members of these associations, along with student, journalist, trade unions and mass based political actions, were often prominent in large number of groups to promote the linked causes of democracy and human rights. A combination of all these levels of society was instrumental in paving the way for the new atmosphere of political pluralism. Thus, the period since the end of the 1980s political systems of most African states have undergone a remarkable and unprecedented transformation. At the beginning of 1989 there were a handful of African states that were relatively democratic, competitive multi-party systems, whilst the majority was still ruled by the Authoritarianism of single party, military regimes or Apartheid, as was the case in South Africa (Hylop, 1999).

South Africa was among the last African countries to democratize and the late 1980's apartheid was still rife and anti-apartheid groups such the African National Congress (ANC) existed underground or in exile. South Africa is a country blessed with an abundance of natural resources including fertile farmlands and unique mineral resources. South African mines are world leaders in the production of diamonds and gold as well as strategic metals such as platinum. As a result of the availability of these metals, South Africa became vulnerable to invasions.

The English and Dutch colonized South Africa in the 17th century. English domination of the Dutch Descendents (known as the Boers or Afrikaners) resulted in Dutch establishing the new colonies of Orange Free State (Bloemfontein) and Transvaal. The discovery of diamonds in these lands around the 1900 resulted in an English invasion that sparked the Boer war. Following independence from England, an uneasy power sharing between the two groups held sway until 1948 when the Afrikaner National Party was able to gain strong majority. Strategists in the National Party invented Apartheid as a means to cement their control over the economic and social systems (Huntington, 1991).

Initially, the aim of Apartheid was to maintain white domination while extending racial separation. Starting in the 1960's, plan of "Grand Apartheid" was executed, emphasizing territorial separation and police repression. In the course of the last three centuries, the black majority populations were segregated and subjected to all forms of political and economic discrimination.

With the enactment of Apartheid laws in 1948, racial discrimination was institutionalized. Race laws touched every aspect of social life including a prohibitation of marriage between non-whites and Whites, and the sanctioning of white only jobs. The Group Areas Act of 1950 mandated geographic separation in business and residences between people of different colors and races. Likewise, the Population Registration act classified the population in four racial categories- White, Colored, Asiatic and Bantu. Apartheid laws such as these intensified in subsequent years (Coleman, 1998).

Non-compliance with the race laws was dealt with harshly. All Blacks were required to carry "Pass books" containing fingerprints, photos and information on access to non- Black areas. In 1951, the Bantu Authorities Act established a basis for ethnic government in African reserves, known as "homelands". These homelands were independent states, which each African state was assigned by the government according to the record of origin, which was frequently inaccurate. All the political rights, including voting, held by an African were restricted to the designated homelands. The idea was that they would be citizens of homelands losing their citizenship in South Africa and any right of involvement with the South African parliament, which held complete hegemony to over the homelands. From 1976- 1981, four of these homelands were created, denationalizing nine million South Africans. Africans living in homelands needed passports to enter South Africa: aliens in their own country (Howarth & Norval, 1998).

Apartheid became a source of conflict; it was a system of brutality maintained by force and terror. A racialised authoritarian order, by necessity, requires the use of violent coercion, with security forces serving the state rather than the law, willing to employ maximum force as a first resort- as witnessed in the murder of and torture of political detainees, and the infamous massacre such as the sharpeville (1960) and Uitenhage (1985). Hence, those who protested against it (political or non violent protest) were dealt with harshly. In 1960, a large group of Blacks in Sharpville refused to carry their passes; the government declared a state of emergency. The emergency lasted for 156 days, leaving 69 people dead and 187 people wounded. Criminal enforcement laws were passed, which empowered the government to declare stringent states of emergency and increased penalties for protesting against or supporting the repeal of a law. The white regime had no intention of changing the unjust laws of Apartheid. Prominent political parties that were fighting apartheid such as the ANC (African National Congress) and PAC (Pan-Africanist Congress) were outlawed and thousands of activists connected to both groups were arrested.

However, the Sharpville Massacre had a number of profound effects on the future of mass movement against apartheid. First, it drew international attention to South Africa's apartheid policies and inspired the world community's gradual isolation of South Africa. Second, it marked the end of an era of mostly non-violent resistance to the White minority government (De villers, 1993).

The government clampdown led the political leaders of movements opposing apartheid to conclude that public protest alone would not succeed in wakening the apartheid regime. The ANC, for example, moved its operations underground and in 1961 it took up arms against the government with the formation of a secret military arm, the Umkhonto we Siwe (The spear of the Nation) known as "Mk", headed by Mandela. In its first 18 months the MK conducted some 200 acts of sabotage resulting in even harsher repression by the government. Mk headquarters were raided, which led to the arrest of its leaders, and to the 1963 Rivonia Trial at which MK leadership, Mandela included, were charged with high treason. A crime, which could have been punishable by death during apartheid, but these leaders got a lighter sentence (under the circumstances) and were sent to prison for life. The reminder of the 1960's saw the emergence of a big challenge to the anti-Apartheid movement because of the outlawing of the major resistance groups (Price, 1991).

In the late 1960's South Africa saw the beginning of the Black Consciousness movement that was initiated by Black university students led by Steve Biko. This new generations of activists, working with Trade Unions, dominated the resistance in the 1970's and 1980's. In addition to the mobilization of Blacks, there were many other individuals and groups that were actively resisting apartheid (Butler, 2001).

In response to and in spite of the resistance efforts, the Apartheid system grew stronger and its grip was extended over all aspects of life. In the early 1970's, the government's color ban on freedom of travel and work began to

reverberate within South African economy. Prices for basic foods and staple items rose sharply making it even more difficult for Blacks to survive. Blacks were also relegated to a standardized, inferior "Bantu education," and higher education was segregated, and several separate universities were established following an ideology of "separate development" propounded by Hendrick Verwoerd, who was one of the ministers in government.

Worker and student strikes broke out in 1973 in Durban and later spilled over to other parts of the country. The renewed protest exploded into riots in June 1976 after government attempted to force Black children in Soweto to study Afrikaans, the White Afrikaner language. Tens of thousands of high school students took to the streets. Police opened fire on the marching students, triggering a nation-wide uprising that left over 1,000 people dead. The student protests breathed new life into the struggle, and underground structures began to re-emerge to encourage mass support for the demonstrations by linking student effort to the broader struggle for national liberation. The regime responded with swift brutality, attempting to quell each strike, protest, and violent outburst and re-establish control. Nevertheless, an increasingly restless population accelerated their demands for civil rights, improved education, universal suffrage, and the elimination of job limitations, urban segregation and the pass laws. Mounting international pressure combined with domestic turmoil to yield some governmental steps toward reform. However, pressures for reform intensified both internally and externally, South Africa was banned from the common wealth and trade unions and the civil society continued to demonstrate, as a result, the National government could not handle the

pressure any more and succumbed to growing demands for political reform and structural economic adjustment (Tucker, & Scott, 1996).

In 1989, F.W. de Klerk replaced South Africa's long-term president P.W. Botha. De Klerk set about more aggressively dismantling the structures of apartheid. The following year, in 1990, he lifted the 30-year ban on the political parties and granted freedom to political dissidents including ANC leader Nelson Mandela. Parliament began the repeal of more than 100 pieces of racist legislation that had formed the official backbone of the apartheid system. Formal negotiations with the government took place at the Convention for a Democratic South Africa (CODESA) began in order to construct a plan for a future democracy. These negotiations continued until an agreement was reached about the establishment of an elected constitutional assembly that will develop a new constitution for the country. In April 1994, for the first time in South African history all races voted in democratic elections, the major opposition party the ANC won the election that signaled the end of apartheid and the beginning of a new dispensation (http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/pages/frontline/shows/mandela/teach.htm).

Even with a reasonable settlement on power, and a plan for managed democratization, democracy in South Africa was still faced with some inherent perils. There was lack of trust between former antagonists; emotions were strong; in a sense that the previous disadvantaged community felt that the perpetrators were not held accountable for their action. Some felt that justice has not been served and the former government were agonizing about their

loss and could not envision their future. As a result the new South African government was faced with the challenge of reconciling a deeply divided society. Therefore in 1995, the Parliament in South Africa established a commission known as the Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC) to investigate gross human abuses by all sides to the conflict. This commission was established under the promotion of National unity and reconciliation act, signed by the then President, Mr. Mandela (Lodge, 1995).

The South African truth and reconciliation commission placed emphasis on the value of truth telling for social and national reconciliation. The argument is that, by uncovering the facts about the past abuses and the wider set of factors and conditions causing them, and hearing stories about the suffering and the harm caused, individuals and society can find closure and the process of reconciliation and healing can take place (Galtung in Abu-Nimur, 2001).

The TRC had unique features including individual amnesty; which provided an incentive for perpetrators to contribute information. If they failed to apply for amnesty, and disclose their actions – they risked prosecution. Amnesty applications came in large numbers, from convicted criminals to perpetrators of apartheid, that is, military personnel, police, and people affiliated with liberation forces, who had actually committed the crimes. The TRC gave both the victims and perpetrators a chance to come forward and tell their side of the story, share their experiences and to do so publicly. The aim was that the entire society should know the extent of human rights violations committed during the conflict of the past, and the suffering caused to victims on all sides.

Victims had to come forward and publicly give an account of the trauma they suffered, while perpetrators publicly acknowledged their wrongdoing. To many, the opportunity to relate the stories of their trauma and have it form part of the public account of the past was valuable in itself. By giving the victims a public platform to tell their story, the truth commission functioned as a therapeutic process, providing victims with closure.

The broadcasted hearings spread the knowledge and acknowledgement of the apartheid's atrocities through out the South African society and the TRC was generally successful in limiting the range of permissible lies about the past. A truth commission cannot create reconciliation or create peace, but it created conditions that made reconciliation and peaceful coexistence possible. Reconciliation is a precondition for, or an integral aspect of, democratization in the sense that democratic consolidation requires and involves the forging of a significant degree of national reconciliation.

(Christy, 2000).

South Africans today as a result, enjoy unprecedented levels of political freedom, greatly improved human rights record, freedom of speech and expression and unparalleled levels of economic growth. South Africa has become a model of multi-racial government and racial coexistence in an area of the world where not too long ago white colonial governments violently oppressed black majorities. Also, South Africa is regarded worldwide as a good example of a peaceful transition from authoritarian to a democratic government and has unlike many other African countries, managed to promote harmony and peaceful coexistence without any signs of regression. The study

therefore seeks to investigate what role democratization has played in securing sustainable peace and conflict resolution in South Africa (Wiseman, 1995).

1.2 Statement of the problem

The research problem is expressed through the following questions:

- What are the causes of conflict in South Africa?
- What is the role of democratization in conflict resolution and peace building?
- What is the impact of democratization on the socio-economic development of South Africa?

1.3 Rationale of the study

The study was motivated by the realization that there has been a limited investigation on the subject of democratization and the promotion of peace in Africa. South Africa is today a good example of peaceful democratic transition in Africa- that, democratisation is possible in Africa and might yield peaceful coexistence, c ultural a nd racial harmony. It was therefore important that a research was conducted to further investigate the role played by democratization in the promotion of peace building and conflict resolution in Africa.

1.4 Aim of the Study

To investigate the role of demcratisation in conflict resolution and peace building with specific focus on South Africa.

1.5 Objectives of the Study

The study will investigate the following specific aspects:

- The causes of conflict in South Africa.
- The role of democratisation in conflict resolution and peace building.
- The impact of democratisation on the socio-economic development of South Africa.

1.6 Significance of the Study

The study will not only benefit Southern African governments but it will benefit all the African governments and stakeholders who are interested in the consolidation of democracy and sustaining peace through out the continent. The study will also serve as a pioneer in the investigation of the relationship between democratization, peace building and conflict resolution.

1.7 Hypothesis

Democratization in South Africa tends to play a positive role in promoting peace building and conflict resolution. The existing policies or strategies in the study area seem likely to address the socio-economic imbalances that mainly the cause of violent behaviour and conflict in southern Africa.

1.8 Methodology

This was a case study about the role of the democratization in conflict resolution and peace building in South Africa. The researcher chose the case study method in order to develop an in depth understanding of the research problem.

1.9 Instruments

The study used document analysis, and interviews to further investigate the problem. The latter method was used so as to accommodate respondents who are not able to read or write.

1.10 Subjects

Sources of information for the study included the following:

Key persons

- A representative of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission
- Political analysts

Secondary sources

- Journal articles, reports, books, newspaper articles or any other document on the subject will be used.

1.11 Methods of data collection

The study used both primary and secondary data to gather information. Primary data collection methods included the following: - observation with inside, and interviews. Observation with inside was used because all knowledge was not gained by means of studying the past records. We learn by observing the events taking place around us. Historical data are static, records remain records but events are fleeting. What happens in the public square today will never be exactly repeated. Live processes contain conformity and uniformity and we are able to judge from what has happen

from any fleeting moment, what may happen again. The researcher, by drawing conclusion from one transitory collection of data may extrapolate what is like to happen again under similar circumstances. Interviews were used to acquire more information, through unstructured interviews with open-ended questions that allowed or granted the respondents an opportunity to elaborate their answers. While secondary data was obtained particularly through literature review. This was done to compensate the information that respondents might have ommitted or that they were less enlightened about.

1.12 Data analysis

Qualitative method of data analysis was used. The researcher used qualitative methods in order to investigate what other authors have written about the subject and to analyse the content of the research.

1.13 Procedure

These were the steps that the researcher followed to reach the sources of information: -

- The researcher made appointments with the relevant departments and conducted the interviews.

1.14 Limitation of the study

The method of analysis used led to researcher bias because qualitative methods are generally subjective in nature; qualitative methods also made it difficult for the researcher to generalize due to its small-scale nature; and

budget constrains impeded on researchers' mobillity and the interviewing of key respondents in different parts of the country.

1.15 Ethical consideration

The researcher ensured that there is informed consent, that is, the researcher made sure that the participants were aware of both the positive or negative aspects or consequences of participation, in order to ensure co-operation. The researcher also ensured that the information provided by the respondents was kept confidential, by assuring the them that the information given would only be used for the stated purpose of the research and that no other person will have access to it.

1.16 Definition of concepts

Democratization is a process that aims at the establishment of democratic political regimes. It refers to the strengthening of both popular participation in the exercise of power and the accountability of government to those they govern. Democracy involves rule by the people through periodic elections of their highest leaders in which all adults can participate, for which office they are eligible, and under the rule of law. Conditions that must prevail in a democratic country includes among others, multi-party - open competition for political office, popularly and regularly elected legislature and head of government, freedom of speech and expression, religious freedom, press freedom and a National constitution that structure the government and elaborate the reciprocal rights and duties of the government and the people,

which all the governing officials and their policies must obey (Sorensan, 1993).

Peace building refers to successfully ending the divisions that lead to war, healing the social wounds created by war, and creating a society where the differences among social groups are resolved through compromise rather than violent conflict. It is a set of strategies designed to promote a secure and stable lasting peace in which the basic human needs of the population are met and violent conflicts do not recur. This definition incorporates both "negative peace and positive peace. Negative peace-which is the absence of physical violence, and Positive peace- which is the capacity to deal with conflict non-violently and creatively. Where there is a fair and equal distribution of resources among different societal groupings (Galtung, 2001).

Conflict resolution is a process that takes a wider view of timing intervention, it seks to address and resolve the deep-rooted sources of conflict before an armed conflict has broken out. Violent behaviours and the hostile attitudes that arise as a result of a contradiction between conflicting groups are dealt with until the structure of the conflict is transformed. However, efforts to resolve conflicts should be maintained even in the heat of battle where the key actors would participate in conflict resolution process such as, peace keeping, peace making, peace building and prevention (Miall, 2001).

Reconciliation is a process of healing the traumas of both victims and perpetrators after violence, providing closure of the bad relations. It also focuses on the involvement of two parties in an interaction of the apology forgiveness and willingness to embark on a new relationship based on acceptance and truth. The process prepares the parties for relations with justice and peace (Lampen, 2000).

Coexistence is an agreement between people of different political and social systems, living in mutual toleration. That is people are willing to endure or permit others with different customs, beliefs or values to exist without condemnation or persecution (Galtung, 2001).

1.17 Theoretical Perspective

Liberalism and Democracy

Some of the main proponents of liberalism include among others Immanuel Kant and John Rawls. Central to liberalism are democracy and interdependence. Liberalist argue that democracies rarely if ever fight each other because democracies are a system of dispersed power, and dispersed power means multiple vet points and groups that could block war. Democracies function through compromise, non-violence, and respect for law. To the extent that these values and habit govern foreign policy, they are conducive to peace. South Africa as a democratic country also places rule of law at the top of its agenda, in its constitution it clearly states that no one is

above the law, and that people should be treated with respect and human dignity.

The South African government further ensures that no violence within or against the state will be tolerated, through the creation of proper, non-discriminating and impartial judicial system. A perfect example of this was when the Boeremag (the Afrikaner right wingers) tried to discredit the government and to carry out vicious racial attacks on the Black community. The Police and the National Intelligence made it they mission to bring this to an end and the perpetrators were arrested. A similar case is also that of Mark Thatcher who contravened South Africa's Foreign Military Assistance Act by funding the mercenaries who wanted to topple the government in Equatorial Guinea. The South African foreign military act clearly stipulates that no person may within the Republic or elsewhere recruit, use or train persons for or finance or engage in mercenary activity. If any South African citizen is involved in organizing a coup, the government will not be liable for any thing that happens to that individual(s), if they are arrested in that country (http://projects.sipri.se/expcon/natexpcon/Safrica/formilass.htm).

Proponents of this theory believe that the power rests with the general public and this is one other reason why democracies are less likely to go to war. Thus, if a country goes to war, those who hold ultimate authority (the general public) will pay the price. South Africa uses universal suffrage to ensure that the public is granted the power to take part in the decision-making processes that affect their lives. They do this by electing representatives that represent

their views, needs and want in the parliament, and ensure that those demands will be met.

Liberalists also assert that, the high level of economic and interdependence among democratic states facilitate a common identity that makes it less likely for liberal states to fight each other. They continue to say that free trade is "God's diplomacy and there is no other certain way of uniting people in bonds of peace", implying that, if goods cannot cross borders, armies will. Liberalists argue that extensive economic intercourse allows states to gain by trade the wealth that they would other wise seek through fighting. Democracy in South Africa made it possible for the country (South Africa) to form trade relations with countries that previously were not interested in making such relation it, due to its oppressive policies that were enforced by the apartheid system. South Africa today, as a result of it being a democracy, has managed to forge trade ties with countries both locally and internationally. One of the most recent trade treaties signed with South Africa being that of a bilateral agreement on Skills transfer and trade with Japan. These theorists maintain that if all states were liberal democracies, peace would prevail (Jervis, 1999).

Realism and democracy

The realists theory of democracy opine that democracy should be seen as referring to the systems of government now in place in the major western societies rather than an abstract ideal against which those systems could be measured and perhaps found wanting. What makes these systems democratic on this view is that they each represent a viable form of popular government, one that it is appointed by and ultimately answerable to the people themselves.

South Africa aligns itself with this view of a democracy in a sense that, the people to whom they remain answerable chose its government. Participation of the majority in South Africa is, however, mainly limited to elections. A view that is held by realists and believe that it can enhance modern representative democracy and make it viable.

Realists assert that representative government are made viable by the fact that participation of the people in their own government is nevertheless limited, in part by the practical impossibility of direct democracy in the government of large populations. The latter point in particular leads many realists to insist that the restrictions of popular participation is in fact a good thing, and that any attempt to expand participation to beyond its present limits would be detrimental to good government. In realist account of democracy, popular participation is regarded on the one hand as necessary and on the other as potentially so destructive that it must be kept strictly within bounds. Thus, one of the most important reason why modern representative democracy is thought to be viable is that, for an overwhelming majority of the population, participation is limited to elections, while for the active minority, it is channeled through a range of competing parties, movements and pressure groups. Hence, in the South African context the majority is represented by the active minority such as trade unions, political parties, and religious organizations that serve to stimulate political debate on competing societal interest, a debate that in turn feeds into the policy making process and, in principle permits the government to device policies and practices that reflect shifting public attitudes (Hindness, 1995).

1.18 Literature Review

Democratization involves building democratic institutions and practices and deepening democratic values in societies. Programming for democratic development includes a range of activity areas, which reinforce each other as they work toward a common end. The implementation of free, fair multiparty elections is often the first step in this process; a democratic outcome is reinforced by an effective legislature, supported by strong constitutional and procedural frameworks and sustained by capable legislators; representative democracy gains legitimacy and stability when it actively consult with non-government stakeholders who have the capacity to effectively participate in the political process; a free media can simultaneously challenge public action while serving as both an alternate information source and an educational tool (Rummel, 1994).

Democracy requires a politically active and involved citizenry, or what some commentators call a vibrant "civil society," to counterbalance and scrutinize the power of state and to provide channels for political expression. An energetic civil society is characterized by a profusion of citizen organizations and associations, such as unions, churches, political parties and movements, cooperatives, neighborhoods, and schools of thought. The existence of these organizations presupposes sustained mobilization on the part of a large number of citizens and serves to stimulate political debate by catalyzing competing societal interests- a debate that, in turn feeds into the policymaking process and, in principle, permits democratic governments to devise policies

and practices that reflect shifting public attitudes. Thus, this implies that, in democratic countries political conflict is not merely normal, it is generally thought to be rather healthy (Baker, 2003).

Why democratization?

One argument is that people are all in nature equal, that it is a natural right that people govern themselves, that they be free in a democratic sense. Since each person is an individual with free will and is equal in this sense to any other individual, the only system of natural governance is the one in which all individuals collectively rule themselves. Another argument is that democracy is the social contract to which people in a state of nature would agree collectively had they no fore knowledge as to how they would personally benefit (as in gaining or losing property). Democracy creates the greatest happiness of the greatest number; it promotes economic and personal development; public policy is most effective because of its incremental nature and the feedback of democratic elections; people are freer and minorities better protected; equality promoted and enhanced; it enables gradual and incremental revolutionary change. But especially important here is the argument is that democracy institutionalizes a means of non- violent conflict resolution- the willingness to negotiate, compromise, and debate, rather than fight. Moreover, the ballot rather than the bullet is the very democratic ideal of voting to resolve differences and chose leaders.

Empirical research support this argument, especially well established is the finding that democracies do not make war on each other, the more democracy the less likely to violent rebellion, revolution, civil war, bloody riots, anti-

government terrorism, and such. Also, democratic leaders generally do not kill their own people through genocide; massacre, extra judicial executions; and other forms of mass murder (Huntington, 1991).

Democratization is important because of one of the most widely (but not universally) accepted trends in international relations, known as democratic peace. Democracy allows people or others to settle their disputes peacefully. Democratization is particularly important in countries, which have gone through an extended period of intractable conflict. These institutions and value systems that make democracy possible are based on the development of the trust, tolerance and capacity for cooperation that make stable peace and reconciliation possible of a conflict resolution process. Unfortunately, the very same reasons that make democratization important make it difficult to achieve. The ethnic and other tensions that give rise to intractable conflict create so much mistrust and intolerance that cooperation is very difficult to achieve. One exception is with South Africa, where the Black and white political elite summoned up unprecedented political will and commitment to multiracial democracy (Monshipouri, 1995).

Democracy is crucial in building and sustaining peace. Functioning democratic structures are conflict management in action and the democratization process – designing and installing such structures is effective upstream conflict prevention in action: putting in place structures that will manage future conflict peacefully when it arises. Effective democracy building requires, among other things, the inclusion of previously excluded voices,

firstly, through dialogue to design a political system, and then through that political system, channelled specifically via the mechanism of parliament into a decision-making process. Democracy building is a continuous and preventative process: a healthy democracy both manages existing conflict and maintains the structures that protect against any future return to violent conflict (Hauss, 1998).

Democratization is a process of gradually introducing more participatory politics, including elections and the creation of a civil society supportive of tolerance, pluralist politics through adherence to constitutional rules of the game. International mediators in today's civil wars often agree, that democratic solutions are a feasible way to re-create a legitimate system of postwar governance. Whether in failed states such Somalia or protracted wars such as in the Great Lakes region, elections are seen as an immediate way to legitimate a negotiated settlement and establish some semblance of postwar governance. Elections after a civil war are especially risky because the competition for power through the ballot box sharpens social differences-usually along the lines over which the war was fought. At the same time, they seem desirable, even necessary, at some point in postwar reconciliation process. When no side is able to prevail on the battlefield and exhaustion leads the parties to make peace, negotiating with foes and moving towards a new system of non-violent conflict management is the only realistic way out. Democratic institutions establish new rules of the games that may allow for a period of power sharing that involves the principal protagonists in the war in a collective government.

Hopes are pinned in the ballot box replacing the battlefield as the principal way in which social conflicts are waged. In sum, there is simply no more just or legitimate way to peacefully manage differences among contending social groups than democracy, however difficult it may seem to move from violent to electoral competition. Democracy is a system of government that allows for conflict to continue, albeit in institutions such as the parliament and courts rather than on the battlefield. The alternatives to democracy in postwar situations- partition or political divorce, dominance of one group over others, long-term international trusteeship, personal or military- may work to contain differences in the short run, as they have in times past. But over time these alternatives do not offer a legitimate and sustainable method for fostering multi-ethnic consensus and promoting reconciliation (Croaker, 2003).

Differences in the economic, social, and cultural and historical circumstances of the world's societies mean that differences will continue between democracy as viewed by one society and democracy as viewed by another, democracy is increasingly being recognized as a response to a wide range of human concerns and as essential to the protection of human rights. Democracy contributes to preserving peace and security, securing justice and human rights, and promoting economic and social development. Democratic institutions and processes channel competing interests into arenas of discourse and provide means of compromise which can be respected by all participants in debates, thereby minimizing the risk that differences or disputes will erupt into armed conflict or confrontation. Because democratic governments are freely chosen by their citizens and held accountable through periodic and

genuine elections and other mechanisms, they are more likely to promote and respect the rule of law, respect individual and minority rights, cope effectively with social conflict, absorb migrant populations and respond to the needs of marginalized groups. They are therefore less likely to abuse their power against the people of their own state territories. Democracy within states thus fosters the evolution of the social contract upon which lasting peace can be built. In this way, a culture of democracy is fundamentally a culture of peace (Held, 1996).

Democratic institutions and processes within states may likewise be conducive to peace among states. The accountability and transparency of democratic governments to their own citizens- who understandably may be highly cautious about war, as it is they who will have to bear its risks and burdens- may help to restrain recourse to military conflict with other states. The legitimacy conferred on democratically elected governments command the respect of the people of other democratic states and fosters expectations of negotiation, compromise and the rule of law in international relations. When states sharing the a culture of democracy are involved in a dispute, the transparency of their regimes may help to prevent accidents, avoid reactions based on emotions or fear and reduce the likelihood of surprise attack (Anstey, 1999).

Lacking the legitimacy or real support offered by free elections, authoritarian governments all too often take recourse to intimidation and violence in order to suppress internal dissent. They tend to reject institutions such as a free press

and an independent judiciary, which can provide the transparency and accountability necessary to discourage such governmental manipulation of citizens. The resulting atmosphere of oppression and tension, felt in neighboring countries, can heighten the fear of war. It is for this reason that one of the first purposes the democratization process is to take effective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to peace. Threatened by the resentment of their own people, non-democratic governments may also be more likely to incite hostilities against other states in order to justify their suppression of internal dissent or forge a basis for national unity.

It is true that the introduction of democratic practice into formerly authoritarian or war-torn states may contribute to civil conflict by opening channels of free expression, including the expression of hatred. Free and fair elections can be followed by the suppression of those defeated. There is also a danger that strengthening civil society without also addressing state capacity may undermine governability or overwhelm the state. Especially for governments in underdeveloped countries, which are typically engaged full time in the provision of basic needs for their populations, the risk to stability that may arise in the early stages of democratization may make them reluctant to continue democratization or even to begin the process at all (Van Vuuren, 1994).

These difficult questions of prioritization and timing suggest several important lessons. First and foremost, it is essential that each state itself decide the form, the pace and character of its democratization process. This suggests a

fundamental prerequisite for democratization: the existence of a state, which can and is willing not only to create the conditions for free and fair elections, but also to support the development and maintenance of the institutions necessary for the ongoing practice of democratic politics. Second, democratization must begin with an effort to create a culture of democracy- a political culture, which is fundamentally non-violent and in which no one party or group expects to win or lose all the time. Such a culture is built upon a societal consensus not about policy, but about the process and framework of democratic political life: that the will of the people is the basis of governmental authority; that all individuals have a right to take part in government; that there shall be periodic and genuine elections; that the power changes hands through popular suffrage rather than intimidation or force; that political opponents and minorities have a right to express their views; and that there can be loyal and legal opposition to the government in power. Third, democratization must seek to achieve institutional balance between the state and civil society.

Finally, support for democratization must be coupled with support for development in order that socio-economic as well as civil and political rights are respected. Although development can take place without democracy, there is no evidence that the breakthrough to development require an Authoritarian regime. There is, ample evidence to suggesting that over the long term, democracy is an ingredient for both sustainable development and lasting peace. Moreover, the globalization of economic activity and communications has generated pressure for democratization and the respect of human rights (Butler, 2001).

In today's world, freedom of thought, the impetus to creativity and the will to involvement are all critical to economic, social and cultural progress, and they are best fostered and protected within democratic systems. In this sense, the economic act of privatization can be as well a political act, enabling greater human creativity and participation. The best way to cultivate a citizen's readiness to participate in the development of his or her country, to arouse that person's energy, imagination and commitment, is by recognizing and respecting human dignity and human rights. The material means of progress can be acquired, but human resources- skilled, spirited and inventive workers- is indispensable, as I the enrichment found through mutual dialogue and the free interchange of ideas. In this way, a culture of democracy, marked by communication, dialogue and openness to the ideas and activities of the world, helps to foster a culture of development.

Democracy is not the affirmation of the individual at the expense of the community, it is through democracy that individual and collective rights, the rights of persons and the right of people, can be reconciled. Many different balances can be struck between the rights of individuals and the rights of the community within the context of democratic politics. Democratic processes are the most reliable way to ensure that these balances are genuinely reflective of the people's broader culture, which, in every society, must itself serve as the ballast for the healthy functioning of democracy (Horowitz, 1995).

Democracy today is receiving widespread acknowledgement for it capacity to foster good governance, which is perhaps the single most important development variable within the control of individual states. By providing legitimacy for government and encouraging people's participation in decision-making on the issues that affect their lives, democratic processes contribute to the effectiveness of the state policies and development strategies. Democratic institutions and practices foster the governmental accountability and transparency necessary to deter national and transnational crime and corruption and encourage increased responsiveness to popular concerns. In development, they increase the likelihood that the state goals reflect broad societal concerns and that the government is sensitive to the societal and environmental costs of its development policies.

Non-democratic states over time tend to generate conditions inimical to development: politicized military rule; a weak middle class; a population constrained to silence; prohibitions on travel; censorship; restrictions on the practice of religion or imposition religious obligation; and pervasive and often institutionalized corruption. Without democratic institutions to channel popular pressures for development and reform, popular unrest and instability will result. The reality is that no state can long remain just or free- thus also have the potential to pursue a successful and sustainable development strategy- if its citizens are prohibited from participating actively and substantially in its political processes and economic, social and cultural development. Increasingly, it is from this perspective that democracy is being seen today- as a practical necessity (Mhone & Edigheji, 2003

CHAPTER TWO

Conflict is a clash of interests, values, actions or directions. Conflict refers to the existence of that clash. The word conflict is applicable from the instant that the clash occurs. Even if one says that there is a potential conflict that person is implying that there is already a conflict of direction even though a clash may not yet have occurred. Conflict is caused by a contradiction that occurs as a result of actual or perceived incompatibility of goals between conflicting parties, generated by different or a mismatch between social values and social structure.

This contradiction then leads to the development different attitudes that include the parties' perceptions and misperceptions of each other and of themselves, and these hostile attitudes leads to negative stereotyping, that often result in violent behaviour. Conflict then, can be viewed as a dynamic process in which the structure, attitudes, and behaviour are constantly changing and influencing one another (Miall & Ramotham, 2001).

THE CAUSES OF CONFLICT IN SOUTH AFRICA

The way a society is organized can create both the root causes of conflict and suitable conditions in which it is likely to occur. Any society which is organized so that its people are treated unequally and unjustly as was the case in apartheid South Africa, is likely to erupt into conflict, especially where leaders do not represent all the members of that society. If unequal and unfair representation is reformed, then the conflicts will be rare. Human beings have basic needs. Everyone needs to be recognized as an individual with a personal identity; everyone needs to be able to feel safe. If these needs are not met people protest,

and protesting can lead to rebellion and violence. Many people value their identity and security in their cultural groupings and its particular point of view-stereotypes between different cultural groups also lead to disputes that can easily turn violent. Unless people learn to understand that their differing cultures are not inevitably a threat to the other, they will also learn how to manage their differences co-operatively and peacefully. One aspect of culture is particularly important: it can create a language and belief system that excludes people, creating "Us/Them", "Insider/Outsider" situations and using language for discrimination, intolerance and hate. If people create a society that does not regard "differences" and "diversity" as problems but as valuable for social growth, many conflicts could disappear (de Bono, 1996).

At the core of the South African conflict were the deep-rooted divisions affecting parties' fundamental interests, needs, and values. These included irreconcilable moral values, matters of justice and human rights, high stakes distributional issues, unmet human needs, and issues of identity.

2.1 Issues of justice

The desire for justice is one that people tend to be unwilling to compromise, assertion of injustice often lead to conflict. An individual's sense of justice is connected to the norms, rights, and entitlement that are thought to underlie decent human treatment. If there is a perceived discrepancy between what a person obtains, what he/she wants, and what he/she believes is entitled to he/she may come to believe that he /she is being deprived of the benefit he/she deserves. This can occur when either a procedure or outcome is viewed as

unfair. When people believe that they have been treated unfairly, they try to "get even" or challenge those who have treated them unjustly. The apartheid system made blacks in South Africa to be ridiculed and discriminated; it made feel like aliens in their own country. Blacks were denied the right to vote- to be part of the decision processes that affected their lives, they were sentenced with out trials, tortured and denied freedom of movement, exposed to inferior quality of education (Bantu education) and limited job opportunities. Indeed, this sense of injustice motivated aggression and retaliation. Black South Africans came to view violence as the only way to address the injustices they were suffering and ensure that their fundamental needs are met. This was because there were no procedures in place to correct the oppressive social structures or bring about retributive or restorative justice (Harris & Reilly, 1998).

However, the apartheid government often responded by attempting to quell the disturbance and maintain the status quo. This has led to ongoing violent conflict. Those who benefited from the injustice often perpetuated it, often without being aware that they are contributing to injustice. Not surprisingly, victims were typically more sensitive to injustice than victimizers. What seemed fair to one person was not fair to another, and these perceptions were affected by self-interest. However, blacks spoke of justice in absolute terms, as some independent and objective standard of fairness that can be used to determine who is right. They rebelled against the system and demanded the establishment of a fair and impartial judicial system, equality before the law

and a democratic constitution stating the rights and privileges of all South Africans regardless of race.

Blacks who have been victims of injustice or unfair treatment grew extremely angry and felt justified to seek justice using whatever means possible or at their disposal (Bekker &Carlton, 1996).

2.2 Rights

Violations of political and economic rights of the black majority populations was among the root causes of the conflict in South Africa, which in turn generated further human rights abuses. When rights to adequate food, housing, employment and cultural life are denied, and large groups of people excluded from the society's decision making processes, there is likely to be great social unrest. Such conditions often gave rise to justice conflicts, in which parties' demands that their basic needs be met. The apartheid government denied the black population their civil rights, including the right to privacy, fair trial, and freedom of movement. The violation of these rights further sparked the conflict in South Africa. The government was extremely militarized, and the police and judicial systems were terribly corrupted. Abductions, arbitrary arrests, detentions without trials, political executions, assassinations and torture became part of the daily activities (Annan, 1998).

2.3 Unmet human needs

Lack of provision of fundamental human needs was another cause of conflict in South Africa. These included basic human needs for food, water, and shelter as well as more complex needs for safety, security, self-esteem, and

personal fulfillment. These more complex needs center on the capacity to exercise choice in all aspects of one's life and to have one's identity and cultural values accepted as legitimate. The need for both distributive justice and the ability to participate in civil society are also crucial. All of these needs are fundamental requirements for human development. Thus, while interests can be negotiated when they come into conflict, needs cannot. Various types of structural violence jeopardize individual' physical safety and security. Poverty, environmental degradation, poor health care, and lack of adequate housing often lead to the denial of their basic needs for dignity, safety, and control over their lives. Because all individuals are driven to fulfill these essential needs, black South Africans were determined to they fight indefinitely to achieve them and would not give up until their goal was attained (Anstey, 1999).

2.4 Identity issues

Identity was one of the fundamental human needs that underlay the South African conflict. Apartheid South Africa made the Black population group to feel that their sense of self is threatened or denied legitimacy and respect, thus identity became a conflictual issue. This is because, identity is integral to one's self-esteem and how one interprets the rest of the world, any threat to identity is likely to produce a strong response. Typically this response is both aggressive and defensive. Conflict in South Africa was maintained by the development of polarized collective identities among group members. Group memberships formed along the lines of nationality, race, and religion. Individuals identified with those in their own group and began to organize

against those in the opposing group. Collective identities were formed around issues such as resisting oppressive social structures. The white racial groups become increasingly polarized and developed hostility towards the blacks, who were viewed as the out-group. A high level of group identification, together with a high degree of perceived threats from the white population, led to a basic impulse among the blacks to preserve their identity by trying to destroy the opponent, which was the apartheid system.

Identity became the primary issue in the South African racial conflict. This conflict centered on matters of security, fair treatment, and a sense of control over one's life. These identity-based concerns were tied to fundamental human needs; conflicts surrounding identity often threatened groups' very existence. Identity conflict was based on people's psychology, culture, basic values, shared history, and beliefs. These tended to be more abstract and were connected to groups' basic needs for survival (Coleman, 1998).

In addition, rigid collective identities made it more difficult for groups to compromise. The white government felt that the blacks posed a threat to their authority or legitimacy, as a result they lashed out; passed discriminatory laws that made it very difficult for blacks to survive. For instance, they controlled the movement of the black people by imposing pass laws that they had to carry wherever they went, came up with restrictive curfews for blacks that made it unlawful to be seen in the city during certain hours of the day, and even public toilets were separated on the basis of race. Those in the out-group (blacks) were excluded, which limited contact between identity groups and contributed to the development of negative stereotypes and intergroup violence. Whites

viewed the other racial groups as evil or even nonhuman and regarded their views and feelings as unworthy of attention. Because merely sitting down with those with a different racial background was seen, as a threat to the whites' identity, even beginning efforts at resolving the differences was extremely difficult. Further more, the negation of the opposing group often becomes a fundamental aspect of one's own identity. During the apartheid regime, for example, an important aspect of identity for the white minority was being anti-black (Harris & Reilly, 1998).

The issue of identity is grounded in nationalism. Nationalism as an ideology affirms the existence of peoples or nations whose members share a common history and destiny. Nationalist sentiments often led whites to see their own group as superior to the other racial groups. This has also led to group members to denigrate or dominate other groups. Because any challenges to one's nation was regarded as a threat to its very existence. Nationalism was one of the main sources that made the conflict in South Africa intractable. Identity issues, nationalism and racism typically involved a history of colonialism and emerge out of history of domination and perceived injustice. Colonization, in particular, often had serious socio-economic and moral implications that persisted. It was a system that perpetuated severe imbalances of power; the more powerful party exploited or abused the less powerful party. Hence, the blacks were denied effective political participation or lacked opportunities for cultural expression. When their identity was denied or simply unrecognized by the white government, blacks recognized these power hierarchies as unjust and rebelled against them (Price, 1991).

2.5 Distributional issues

The apartheid system institutionalized the uneven social distribution of resources in South Africa, which caused serious structural scarcity for blacks. Land ownership was tightly restricted in both urban and rural areas, curtailing economic advancement. Unequal access to land affected 15 million blacks living in the homelands or as tenants and laborers on "white" land. In 1980s, 95 percent of the black population earned less than 600 dollars per month, whereas 89 percent of the white population earned more. With an average disposable income of approximately 950 rand a year – one-sixteenth the white average – homeland farmers in particular could not make the long-term investment necessary to protect their land. Not only did blacks suffer from an imbalanced distribution of the quantity of land, but also they also often received the most marginal productive land. Moreover, under the apartheid regime, structural scarcities of land were often reinforced by stark shortfalls in agricultural inputs, such as capital, fertilizer, veterinary services, and new agricultural technologies.

Structural scarcity of land also existed within the former homelands. Rights to communal land were unevenly distributed among homeland populations: up to 80 percent of production came from 20 percent of the farmers who controlled most of the land. In urban areas black town ships were built on sites not useful to the white community. They were often overcrowded, short of housing, and located downwind from dirty industries. Infrastructure was inferior, with few services such as electricity and running water. Over crowding and poverty meant that new residents built their houses from nonconventional materials

scavenged from local dumps and public buildings; they used mud, grass, and straw from nearby streams, fields, and hillsides, which tended to increase local erosion and flooding damage. In sum, the black population, with little political or economic power in South Africa, was forced to subsist on a severely restricted and eroded land base (www.ppu.org.uk/learn/conflict/st_conflict.html).

Under apartheid, the average populations density of the homelands was 10 times the density of rural "white" South Africa. When labor requirements in commercial agriculture declined, apartheid ensured that black South Africans could not move to cities when they were expelled from rural white areas. Police forcibly removed blacks to the homelands; partly as a result of this forced migration the population of homelands grew drastically but the land area of homelands did not increase. In addition to this in-migration, the homelands experienced high natural population growth rates. The fertility rate for blacks in the 1980's was estimated at 5 children per woman. This was because the apartheid system denied blacks access to proper education, health care, family planning, and secure sources of livelihood- the things that make small families possible and advantageous. Hence, the conflict over the distribution of resources became a major issue in South Africa. The blacks wanted to gain more power and reverse the exploitative relationship, and those in government did not want to give up the benefit associated with their position. The apartheid government was unwilling to compromise and share the resources equally and as a result the conflict exacerbated (De villers, 1993).

CHAPTER THREE

THE ROLE OF DEMOCRATIZATION IN CONFLICT RESOLUTION AND PEACE BUILDING

Democratic consolidation and peace building seem more likely when certain conditions are present, these conditions are: when the polity has geographical, constitutional and political legitimacy; where there is agreement about the rules of the political game and the parties abide by them; where opposing groups agree on policy restraint; where there are low or declining levels of poverty; and where ethnic, cultural, and religious cleavages are not deep and uncompromising.

3.1 Legitimacy

No democratic polity may promote peace or survive for long, that is, it cannot consolidate unless it enjoys some form of legitimacy, whether of passive acceptance kind or whether of the more unusual positive kind. However, the concept legitimacy may be better understood and operationalised if it is broken down into three components: Geographical, constitutional and political legitimacy.

Geographical legitimacy means that those who live within the state accept its territorial definition and appropriateness of their place within it or, at least, they do not positively oppose it, except by constitutional means. Where, for instance, people do not consider the state legitimate in this respect, democratic politics come under threat. In extreme cases the threat might take the form of secessionist or irredentist movement, where a group or region wishes to break

away and establish it own state or join another. Where people have no political means for achieving secession from the state, they are unlikely to abide by democratic processes and violence is inevitable (Bayart, 1998).

Constitutional legitimacy refers to the acceptance of the constitution- that is the formal structure of rules whereby political power is competed for, organized and distributed- though again the range of possible kinds of acceptance needs to be born in mind. One of the toughest parts of the democratization process lies precisely in establishing such a constitution, as the complex negotiations in South Africa between 1990 and 1994 illustrated. As democracies emerge from the political darkness of authoritarian rule, a whole range of interests erupts into the more open but less predictable political space, or stand exposed in it. Some may be powerful and rich and fear change; some may be poor and hitherto weak and demand change. They maybe economic interests (political parties and legislatures), functional interests, ethnic interests (Afrikaners in South Africa), regional interests or a mix of some of them. Each will want to have a shrewd idea of how the new distribution of power in the constitution will affect it, and each will want to ensure that their interests will be protected (Lodge, 1995).

To some extent constitutions can do that, which is why negotiation and bargaining is normally so tough as groups seek to influence the shape of the constitution and what goes into it. Will it be a parliamentary or presidential system? If the latter, how powerful will the presidency be relation to the legislature, and what will the role of political parties be? How will the army be

controlled? and how much power-and resources- will the regions or sub national regional governments have? Will there be a Bill of rights? What will go into it? Will private property be protected as in the new 1996 South African constitution? If so, then the constitution places immediate and far reaching constrains on government options in aspects of, say, economic policy (Leftwich, 1995).

Political legitimacy refers to the extent to which the electorate (or realistically, organized parties in it, or other institutions like the army) regards the government in power as being entitled, procedurally to be there. That is to say, a government may be said to be politically legitimate where the outcome of the elections reflect voting preferences according to the rules and the results have not been rigged. But the point here is that, geographical, constitutional and political forms of legitimacy, are necessary conditions for a democratic polity to survive.

The apartheid government was not legitimate government because the entire South African community did not accept it. They are discriminatory laws and the denial of universal suffrage to the majority of its population made it an illegitimate government. It did not take into consideration any of the above-mentioned conditions; it was a one-sided system of government concerned with maintaining the status quo and remaining in authority. Therefore, the new democratically elected South African government made it its mission to ensure that elections are free and fair; that the constitution equally represents each and protects the rights of every citizen regardless of their colour, race or ethnicity; and ensured that all the discriminatory laws and policies are

abolished and replaced by new and representative ones. Thus reducing the likelihood of conflict and disruptions, and promoting peace (Held, 1996).

3.2 Consensus about the rules of the game

There is need to be a consensus or agreement about the rules of the political games and loyalty to those rules, and to the democratic process itself, especially among political elites, so that democracy can survive and create appropriate environment for peace to prevail. This is because democratic politics involve open competition for power, no group can be certain of wining. Democratization therefore can be said to be a processes that institutionalizes "uncertainty". Indeed, the shift from authoritarian rule to democracy means precisely that the group, which has held power (such as whites in South Africa) abandons effective control over outcomes and thus has to embrace "uncertainty."

This uncertainty has at least two dimensions, both understandable threatening to the group which is giving up control: (a) that it may not win the elections and hence would lose power, and (b) that the policy changes introduced by the new government would damage its interests. The major political parties in South Africa have agreed upon their constitution that, when an election has been judged to have taken place according to the rules of the game (be free and fair), then for democracy to work the losers must abide by the results, thereby show commitment to the democratic process itself. Winners on the other hand must know that they are not in power forever and will have to compete again and put their record to the test in the next elections, which they cannot suspend. The ruling party must commit themselves to effective

demobilization, the ballot box and committee rooms in their struggle for power or for influence over policy (Lodge, 1995).

3.3 Policy restrains by the winning party

It is unlikely that any group or party would accept the rules of the electoral game if losing meant that it or the interests it represented would lose too much. It follows that while they must accept the outcome, winners must also accept that there are significant limits to what they can do with their newly won power. This third condition means that democratic consolidation also depends on the victorious parties exercising policy retrains when in government, although the temptation is often to rewrite the policy book. That is to say, new or born-again democracies are more likely to consolidate and prosper in peace if the new government does not pursue highly contentious policies too far or too fast, especially where these policies threaten other major interests (Leftwich, 1995).

The major political parties in South Africa established the limits on policy change during the course of negotiations on the Convention for a Democratic South Africa before the process of democratic transition was completed. This shows that while the distinction between democratic transition and consolidation is conceptually important, there are also very important continuities between them. That is, what happens in the course of democratization has important consequences for what happens in the future.
They had pursued developmental goals that would benefit everybody including the losing party. For example, the ANC led government in South

Africa has since 1994 been extremely careful not to threaten white economic interests or the interests of capital more generally. Also, the government would not dispossess the wealthy because they wished to sustain the political agreements that will keep peace and democracy going. This is because there has been some form of 'pact' (power sharing agreement) between the elites on the limits of policy change under the new democratic auspices: these were even written into the constitution.

This was also motivated by the fact that the new government did not only seek goodwill but also foreign aid and investment from major western institutions and companies. Such instances might even be threatened if government policies were thought to be too radical or unfriendly to the operation of free markets, a feature of new democracies, which illustrate the continuing salience of external factors even after democratization has been completed. The external forces and international organizations continue to have major impact South Africa's developmental issues because the country's democratization opened the gate way for South Africa to be part of the global village (Sparks, 1995).

3.4 Poverty Eradication

There has been a strong positive correlation between the wealth of a country and democracy, however this does not mean that wealth is the only sufficient condition for democracy. One reason why serious poverty seems to restrain democratic consolidation is that in profoundly poor countries, the struggle for scarce resources, and the enormous advantages which permanent control of the state may bring to a party or faction, makes democracy very unlikely.

Incumbents holding state power will be reluctant to engage in compromise and will be very unwilling to lose control. Suspending democracy becomes a good way of staying in power. Poverty often gives rise to what is often called the 'politics of the belly.' Moreover, poverty is often accompanied by low levels of literacy, formal education and communication, none of which have historically been associated with stable democracy. The eradication of poverty has thus been one of South Africa's top policy priorities since its democratization. This was prompted by the realisation that no political democracy can survive and flourish if the majority of its people remain in poverty, without land, without their basic needs being met and without tangible prospects for a better life. Attacking poverty and deprivation must be the first priority for any democratic government (Monshipouri, 1995).

Thus, in its attempt to redress the imbalances of the past and the inequitable distribution of resources; which have perpetuated the high levels of poverty in the past, the South African government came up with relevant initiatives to reduce poverty. These included initiatives such as - the building of low cost houses for the poor; so as to curb the high rate of homelessness; implemented land reform policies; created job opportunities for the previously disadvantaged; improved educational facilities to curb illiteracy; and social grants for children, orphans and the physically impaired. Also, the policies in South Africa were developed in cognisance with the socioeconomic conditions of the country (Lipset, 1993).

3.5 Ethnic or cultural cleavages as constrains on democratic peace

Sharp national, ethnic, cultural or religious difference –especially where they overlap with material inequalities between the groups, make both transition and consolidation difficult. The South African society has been divided by race and material inequalities for decades, which has made peace impossible. However, the effects of sharp ethnic or cultural cleavages were mitigated by the new carefully crafted constitution, which recognized the rights and privileges of all the South Africans regardless of their cultural background or political affiliation. Further more, inter-elite pacts keep the South African democracy going by binding or buying groups into the institutional structures of democracy. These countervailing conditions, enable South Africa to deal with divisions of this kind make it easy to maintain peace and sustain democracy.

If these ethnic or religious differences are not addressed, they can become the contours along which political mobilization flows, often with uncompromising and therefore anti-democratic consequences (Mainwaring, 1995).

Apartheid left behind a legacy of inequality. In the labour market and education sector, the disparity in the distribution of jobs, occupations, literacy, and income levels reveals the effects of discrimination against black people, women, and people with disabilities. These disparities were reinforced by social practices which perpetuated discrimination in education and employment against these disadvantaged groups, as well as by factors outside the labour market and education sector, such as lack of housing, medical care and transport. These disparities could not be remedied by simply eliminating discrimination. It was therefore necessary that, improved socio-economic policies, programs are designed and positive action taken to redress the imbalances of the past.

Thus, the transition from apartheid to post-apartheid South Africa was guided by the Reconstruction and Development Program (RDP), which had as its goal the mobilization of the people and the country's resource towards the final eradication of apartheid and the building of a democratic, non-racial and non-sexist future. The RDP policy framework was designed to promote integrated development, social transformation, and the means by which the process of change can be effectively managed. It focused on reconstruction on the roles government at all levels should play in realising its goals. The RDP became a vehicle to ensure equitable development of life opportunities for all the South African citizens, and its objectives included among others, to promote peace

and security; nation building; meeting the basic needs and building the infrastructure; building the economy; and developing human resource (White paper on reconstruction and development, 1994).

The Reconstruction and development programme was only the first in the series of transformation policies to follow. The government also decided to introduce the Employment Equity Bill to address some of these issues. The Bill seeks to eliminate the unfair discrimination in employment, and to provide for affirmative action to redress the imbalances of the past and to create equality in employment "employment equity". This legislation was drawn with the view of advancing those groups who have been disadvantaged as a result of discrimination caused by laws and social practices, and not with the view to seek retribution for the past injustices.

Blacks people women and people with disabilities today face a significant disadvantage in employment. These included occupational segregation, inequality in pay, lack of access to training and development opportunities, and high levels of unemployment. Black people, in particular, have suffered particular and pernicious disadvantages as a result of job reservation and lack of access to skills and education under apartheid. This discrimination sometimes takes the form of direct and conscious decisions, based on prejudice or stereotypes, to exclude certain groups from jobs and promotions. For instance, some employers, believing that women are not assertive enough to manage or supervise other employees, will not consider employing a woman in any senior position (Todaro, 1997).

Whilst the bill seeks to address inequalities within the sphere of employment (inside the labour market) it should be noted that these inequalities are also reflected outside the labour market. Extra-labour market inequalities are extreme and they have a direct effect on the quality and nature of labour that is supplied to the labour market. Factors like disparities in ownership of productive assets, the unequal division of household labour and the geographic distribution of population groups under apartheid all contributed to the reinforcement of these inequalities.

Whereas South Africa is not a poor country by international standards, it is infamous for having the most unequal distribution of income in the world. In its 1996 country review, the International Labour Organisation (ILO) concluded that South Africa had the highest levels of inequality of any country in the world for which the ILO had data. The Labour Market Commission also notes that South Africa's skewed income distribution is reflected in the fact that the bottom 20% of income earners captures a mere 1,5% of national income. Further, poverty is overwhelmingly concentrated in the African and Coloured population: 95% of the poor are Africans, and 65% of Africans are poor. The Labour Market Commission notes that roughly 33% of the Coloured populations live in poverty compared to 2.5% Asians and 0.7% for Whites. This racial inequality is also reflected in the situation in respect to unemployment in the country. Using an expanded definition of unemployment, among Africans, unemployment stands at roughly 41%, among Coloureds it is 23%, whilst among Asians 17% but only 6,4% amongst Whites (www.polity.org.za/html/govdocs/bills/1997/equity.html).

There is also a gender element to the inequality, with women having a higher unemployment rate than men. Occupational segregation is still a serious problem even within the new public service. Hence, the government saw it fit to implement Affirmative Action. The primary aim of Affirmative Action was to redress the imbalances created by apartheid. This does not mean that just as a white skin was a passport to privileges in the past, so a black skin should be the basis privileges in the future or does it mean that the government wants to do away with qualifications. The government is not against the upholding of standards as such but the sustaining of barriers to the attainment of standards. The special measures that the government has envisaged to overcome the legacy of past discrimination are not intended to ensure the advancement of unqualified persons, but to see to it that those who been denied access to qualifications in the past can become qualified now. And those who have been qualified all along but overlooked because of past discrimination, are at last given their due (Rowland, 1995).

Affirmative Action is rooted in the principles of justice and equality. Racial discrimination in education and access to employment, coupled with constant denial of opportunities to blacks and women, has led to the very poor overall skills levels to be found in the South African labour market. Inequalities lead to market distortion, which in turn resulted in the inadequate utilization of resources. It follows that the reduction of inequality in society is therefore a way of promoting economic growth. Employment discrimination and poor educational opportunities entail significant economic costs in terms of lower national output, labour market inefficiency, higher inflation, and excessive

welfare and penal system costs. The Bill recognises that the mere removal of discrimination will not lead to the advancement and development of groups that have previously denied such opportunities. Employment equity measures including affirmative action are needed to ensure that equality does not just remain a formality but is achieved in a substantive way (Monaheng, 1998).

Furthermore, the rejection of apartheid created many new opportunities, but jobs went unfilled due to lack of skilled workers. The legacy of apartheid created a dearth of employable people. Also, the requisite skills began to change, reflecting the new economy and its appetite for knowledge workers. South Africa's business was faced with a frustrating paradox: business taking off, but there were no workers to fill positions. Global access and competition was increasing, but business was losing talent to outside organizations. South Africa was as a result faced with the challenge of not only creating a workforce of the future, but also the workforce of today. It had to train and educate its current population while preparing its future workforce (Makgohloa, 1995).

South Africa rose to the challenge by enacting legislation and creating programs to train its workforce while building a national framework for life long learning. The process was set in motion by a combination of legislative acts; the Skills Development Act (1998), the National Qualifications Framework, operated as the building blocks in creating a new South African workforce. These acts became leveling instruments, designed to pave over previous inequalities by preventing and prohibiting unfair discrimination and

promoting equality. Skills development act was promulgated to increase investment in education and training, right historical wrongs regarding access and opportunities to learn, and encourage employers to use their workplace as active learning environments (www.findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_m4467/is_9_55/ai_78873714).

In addition, to help workers who have experience but little formal education, the Adult Basic education and training program was created. Abet enables semiliterate or illiterate workers to gain literacy. Once they have been empowered with reading abilities, workers can obtain a formally recognized qualification under the National Qualification fund and move up the career ladder (Rowlands, 1995).

The government's socio-economic policies coupled with its so-far-successful management of the political transition to majority rule have bolstered confidence in its ability to transform South Africa from a conflict-ridden apartheid society to a prosperous democratic success story.

CHAPTER FIVE

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Conclusion

It has been reflected in the study that conflict in South Africa was caused by the lack of confidence in the former apartheid government that represented the viewpoints of only a quarter of the South African society and distributed the resources unfairly. It used cultural and ethnic stereotypes as a tactic of maintaining authority. The study also showed that authoritative governments as was the case in South Africa tend to perpetuate inequality and unfairness in their governing processes that often lead to the outbreak of violence. Lacking legitimacy, authoritative governments all too often take recourse to intimidation and violence in order to suppress internal dissent. They tend to repress institutions such as a free press and an independent judiciary, which can provide transparency and accountability necessary to discourage such governmental manipulation of citizens.

The study has further reflected that it was through the democratisation process that South Africa managed to overcome the adversities caused by apartheid and became a peaceful and prosperous democratic country. South Africa's democratization process began with a negotiated power sharing agreement between the former government and the main opposition party the (ANC), that enabled South Africa to create a culture of democracy. That is, a political culture which is fundamentally nonviolent; whereby the state promote good governance by creating suitable conditions for conducting free and fair

elections; a culture where no one party or group experts to win or lose all the time; where there is consensus about the process, the framework and the rules of the democratic political life. Such a culture is built upon the belief that the will of the people is the basis of governmental authority; that all have the right to take part in government, that power should change hands through popular suffrage rather than intimidation or force; that political opposition and minorities have a right to express their views; and a system that accepts and acknowledges loyal opposition to the government in power.

The study has also reflected that, in order for democratization to succeed there is a need for the creation of a new constitution and policy changes. Former oppressive and unrepresentative policies need to be replaced by new all-inclusive policies that safeguard the rights of every individual regardless of their background. Reformatory bills or policies such as the Land Reform policies, Affirmative Action and Employment Equity Bills had to be passed to redress the imbalances created by the past regime. This was done in an attempt to balance or improve the socio-economic standards of the previously marginalized with those who have been privileged before. Democratization is also a conflict resolution and peace building exercise as it enables parties to resolve the conflicts that they would otherwise be fought on the battleground through the ballot box.

Conflict resolution and peace building are and should an integral part of the democratization process. Transitions to democracy go through a number of phases such as, transactional (negotiation, mediation); structural (capacity

building and civil society building, including media, rule of law institutions, human rights etc.); and transformational (confidence building, reconciliation and peace education). Conflict resolution is critical to each of these phases and at all levels of society. Specifically, conflict resolution projects, particularly those involving marginalized groups in society, such as women, youth, children and ethnic or religious minorities, contribute to sustaining a culture of democracy. Democracy in today's ever-changing world means pluralism; identity and geography are no longer synonymous and "majority rule" must give way to power sharing in societies with a multiplicity of ethnic, religious, racial, and socio-economic groups. Conflict resolution addresses the needs of pluralism; it can be a slow process, but it helps ensure equal rights, a fundamental principle of democracy.

Recommendations

A number of southern African countries such as Zimbabwe and Lesotho are currently experiencing leadership problems (problems on how to govern their communities); high levels of poverty; and continuous out break of violence. Thus, the recommendation for this factor is that Southern African countries should embark on democratization, rather the hosting period elections that are followed by continuous oppression and deprivation. Democratization here implies that, these countries should start on the negotiation table to reach an all-inclusive agreement on the processes of government and adhere to thos3e promises. They have to realize that democratization involves creating a legitimate government (a government that is accepted by all), establishing a

democratic constitution as the basis for rule of law, exercising policy restrains by the winning party, dealing away with cultural and ethnic cleavages, acceptance of opposition to the party in government.

Most of the Southern African countries tend to perceive hosting regular elections as being synonymous with democratization, hence another recommendation is that education on democratization and peace education should be included in their education (school) curriculum so that there can be more clarity on the subject.

As South Africa is one of the most promising Southern African countries on transition to democratization, other in the region can use it as an example and follow in its footsteps, but should be done bearing in mind that socio-economic conditions of each and every country differs, so it is important that each country determines the form, the timing, the pace and character of its democratization process.

References

Books

1. Annan, K. (1998) Foreword. In Harris P. & Reilly B. (eds) *Democracy and deep rooted conflict*: Options for negotiators. Stockholm: International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance.
2. Anstey, M. (1999) *Managing Change*: Negotiated conflict. Zebra Publications: Hout Bay.
3. Baker, H. P. (2003) Conflict resolution versus democratic government: Divergent Path to peace? *In Turbulent peace: The challenges of managing international conflict.* Edited by Crocker, A.C., Hampson, F.O. & Aall, P. United States University Press: Washington, D.C.
4. Bayart, J.F. (1998) *The state in Africa*: The politics of the belly. Longman Press: London.
5. Bekker, S & Carlton, D. (1996) *Racism, xenophobia and ethnic conflict.* Durban: Indicator Press.
6. Butler, A. (2001) *Democracy and apartheid*: Political theory, comparative politics and the modern South African state. Palgrave: New York.
7. Christie, K. (2002) *The South African Truth Commission.* Macmillan Press: Basingstoke.
8. Coleman, M. (ed) (1998) *A crime against humanity*: Analysing the repression of the apartheid state. Johannesburg: Human Rights Committee.
9. Crocker, C.A. (editor) (2003*) Turbulent Peace*: The challenges of managing International conflict. Unites States institute of Peace Press: Washington D.C.

10. De Bono, E. (1996) *Conflicts*: A better way to resolve them. London: Harrap Limited.

11. De Beer, F, & Swanepoel, H. (1998) *Community Development and beyond: issues, structures and procedures.* Pretoria: J.L. Van Schalk.

12. De villers, D. (1993) *Transition by transactions*: A theoretical and comparative analysis of negotiated transitions with special reference to South Africa, 1989-1992. Unpublished D Phil thesis, University of Port Elizabeth.

13. Galtung, J (2001) After violence, Reconstruction, reconciliation and Resolution in Abu-Nimur, M, *Reconciliation, Justice and Coexistence. London:* Lexington books.

14. Government of South Africa. (1994) *White paper on reconstruction and development.* Pretoria, September.

15. Harris, P & Reilly, B. (eds) (1998) *Democracy and deep-rooted conflict*: options for negotiators. Stockholm: International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance.

16. Held, D. (1996) *Models of democracy* (2nd edition) Polity Press

17. Hindess, B. (1995*) Discourse of Power: From Hobbes to Foucault.* Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

18. Horowitz, D.L. (1995) *A democratic South Africa*? Constitutional engineering in divided society. Oxford University Press: Cape Town.

19. Howarth, D.R. and Norval A.J. (editors) (1998) *South Africa in transition*: New theoretical perspective. St. Martin's Press, INC. United States of America.

20. Huntington, S. (1991) *The Third Wave*. University of Oklahoma Press: Norman OK.

21. Hyslop, J. (editor) (1999) *African democracy in the era of globalization.* Witwatersrand University Press: Johannesburg.

22. Jervis, R. (1999) Neorealism, Neoliberalism, and cooperation: Understanding the Debate" Journal of International Relations, Vol.25 (2).

23. Lambourne, W. (2001) Justice and Reconciliation, Post conflict peace building in Abu-Nimur, M. *Reconciliation, Justice and Coexistence.* London: Lexington books.

24. Lampen, J. (editor). (2000). *No Alternative? Nonviolent responses to repressive regimes.* New York: William SessionsLtd.

25. Leedy, P.D. (1997) *Practical Research Planning and Designs.* Sixth edition, Prentice Hall, INC. New Jersey, Columbus, Ohio.

26. Lederach, J.P. (1997) *Building Peace: Sustainable Reconciliation in Divided societies.* Washington DC: United States institute of peace press.

27. Leftwich, A. (ed) (1995) *Democracy and development*: Theory and Practice. Cambrige: Polity Press.

28. Lipset, J. (1993) " *A comparative analysis of the social requisites of democracy.* " International social science journal, Vol.136, pp.155-75.

29. Lodge, T. (1995) " *South Africa*: Democracy and development in a post-apartheid society" in Leftwich,a. (ed) pp.188-191).

30. Mainwaring, S. (1995) *Transitions to democracy and democratic consolidation*: Theoreical and comparative issues. Cambrige: Polity Press.

31. Mhone, G. & Edigheji, O. (2003) *Government in the New South Africa*: The challenges of globalization. University of Cape Town Press: Cape Town.

32. Miall, H. Ramsbotham and Woodhouse. (2001) *Contemporary Conflict Resolution, Post Settlement Peace Building.* Malden, MA: Blackwell.

33. Monaheng, T. (1998) Participation and human development: some implementation problems. *Africanus*, 28 (1).

34. Monshipouri, M. (1995) *Democratization, Liberalization and Human rights in the Third world.* Lynne publishers: Canada and USA.

35. Ojo, B.A. (Editor) (1999) *Contemporary African Politics*. A comparative Study of political transition to democratic legitimacy. University press of America: New York, Oxford.

36. Price, R.M. (1991) *The apartheid state in crisis*: Political transformation in South Africa, 1975-1990. New York: Oxford University Press.

37. Rothman, J. (1997) *Resolving Idèntity Based Conflict in Nations, Organizations and Communities*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

38. Rowland, J. (1995) Empowerment examined. *Development in practice,* 5(2).

39. Rummel, J. (1994) *Death by Government*. New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers.

40. Sparks, A. (1995) *Tomorrow is another country*: the inside story of South Africa' negotiated revolution. London: Heinemann.

41. Sorensen, G. (1993) Democracy and Democratization: Process and Prospects in a changing world. West view: Boulder.

42. Todaro, M.P. (1997) Economic development. 6th edition. London: Longman.

43. Tucker, B. ad Scott, B.R. (1996) *South Africa*: Prospects for successful transition. The Rustic press (Pty) Ltd. Cape Town

44. Wiseman, J.A. (editor) (1995) *Democracy and Political change in Sub-Saharan Africa.* Routledge: New York, United States of America.

Web sites

1. The long walk of Nelson Mandela: Viewers' and teachers' guide. (n.d) Available from: http://www.Pbs.org/wgbh/pages/frontline/shows/Mandela/teach.htm (04/06/2004)
2. Yergin, D. and Stanislaw, J. (1998) Development in Africa. Available From: http://www.pbs.org/wghb/commanding heights/shared/minitextlo/ess_africa_devel.htm (30/09/2004)
3. Ocitti, J. (1999) Media and Democracy in Africa: Mutual political bedfellows or implacable arch-foes. Available from: http://www.wcfia.harvard.edu/fellows/papers98-99/ocittoi.pdf (30/09/2004)
4. Africa watch overview (n.d) Available from: http://www.org.reports/1992/wr92/afw.htm (30/09/2004)
5. Hauss, C. (1998) http://www.intractableconflict.org/m/democratization.jsp Available from: (18/10/2004)
6. http://www.ppu.org.uk/learn/conflict/st_conflict1.html (09/12/2004)
7. http://projects.sipri.se/expcon/natexpcon/Safrica/formilass.htm (30/11/2004)

Book:The role of democratization in conflict resolution and peace building in Southern Africa:a case study of South Africa.

Author:Boitumelo Phiriepa

Number: A33641200162739C

Book:The role of democratization in conflict resolution and peace building in Southern Africa:a case study of South Africa.

Author:Boitumelo Phiriepa

Number: A33641200162739C

THE ROLE OF DEMOCRATIZATION IN CONFLICT RESOLUTION AND PEACE BUILDING IN SOUTHERN AFRICA: A CASE STUDY OF SOUTH AFRICA

NORTH WEST UNIVERSITY
A33641200162739C

BOITUMELO PHIRIEPA

b1099674b
LIBRARY
MAFIKENG CAMPUS
Call No.: TH 321.80968
2006 -02- 21 PHI
Acc. No.: 06 | 30368
NORTH-WEST UNIVERSITY
i 11498262

2005 NORTH WEST UNIVERSITYSUPERVISOR

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ITEM			PAGE
Abstract			i
Acknowledgements			ii
Dedication			iii
Chapter One	Introduction Background		1
	1.2	Statement of the Problem	13
	1.3	Rationale of the Study	13
	1.4	Aim of the Study	13
	1.5	Objectives of the Study	14
	1.6	Significance of the Study	14
	1.7	Hypothesis	14
	1.8	Methodology	14
	1.9	Instruments	15
	1.10	Subjects	15
	1.11	Methods of Data Collection	15
	1.12	Data Analysis	16
	1.13	Procedure	16
	1.14	Limitations	16
	1.15	Ethical consideration	17
	1.16	Definition of Concepts	17
	1.17	Theoretical Perspective	19
	1.18	Literature Review	23
Chapter Two	The Causes of conflict in South Africa		33
	2.1	Issues of Justice	34
	2.2	Rights	36
	2.3	Unmet Human Needs	36
	2.4	Identity Issues	37
	2.5	Distributional Issues	40
Chapter Three	The role of Democratisation in Conflict Resolution and Peace Building		42
	3.1	Legitimacy	42
	3.2	Consensus About the Rules of the Game	45
	3.3	Policy Restrains by the wining Political Party	46
	3.4	Poverty Eradication	47
	3.5	Ethnic or Cultural Cleavages as Constrains on Democratic Peace	49

Chapter Four	The impact of Democratisation on the Socio-Economic Development of South Africa	50
Chapter Five	Conclusions and Recommendations	56
Reference		60

ABSTRACT

The aim of the study was to investigate the role of democratisation in peace building and conflict resolution.

The findings of the study have revealed that democratisation plays a pivotal role in conflict resolution and peace building. It provides legitimacy for governments and encourages people's participation in decision-making on issues that affect their lives; democratic processes contribute to the effectiveness of the state policies and developmental strategies.

The study has also showed that democratic institutions and practices foster the governmental accountability and transparency necessary to deter national and transnational crime and corruption and encourage increased responsiveness to popular concerns. In development, they increase the likelihood that the state goals reflect broad societal concerns and that the government is sensitive to the societal environmental costs of its development policies.

By involving people in decision-making, democracy ensures mutual respect and satisfaction between the state and its citizens, and this in turn promotes peace and stability in a country.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

During the course of researching and writing this report, I have incurred innumerable debts of gratitude. I am indebted first and foremost to the various libraries in South Africa, that have allowed me to utilise their resources and services. Without exceptions their librarians have been unfailingly helpful. In particular, I'm indebted to the Staff of the North West University (Mafikeng Campus) and the Africa Institute of South Africa, for providing possible books and material to make this report a success.

I am also indebted to my supervisor, Mr. K. Ewusi, for his valuable comments and suggestions upon the earlier draft of this report.

I further wish to express my sincere gratitude to my family, especially Mrs. K. A. Phiriepa, for her support, motivation and encouragement. She has been my pillar of strength.

Finally, I owe a special thank you to the Lord Almighty for guarding me through this tormenting and challenging task.

DEDICATION

To

My beloved mother,

Kelebogile Phiriepa

CHAPTER ONE

Introduction

1.1 Background

Africa was colonized by the European powers mainly the British and the French since 1890-1960, as part of their civilizing mission. However, the wave of Asian independence in the 1940s together with the founding of the United Nations dedicated to human rights and self-rule inspired nationalist movements and provided a model for decolonization and independence all over the world. By 1950 the old colonial order seemed to have lost its force, its historical relevance. Two world wars had thoroughly discredited the European powers' claim to a civilizing mission (Bayart, 1998).

In Africa, colonial rule was losing its advocates, most of who felt that the economic benefits no longer outweighed the growing burden of administering empires. Meanwhile, a new elite was on the rise through out the colonies, made up of a privileged few who had acceded to western education and returned with technical credentials as engineers, lawyers, or accountants. This new professional class had also absorbed western political values, and could ably challenge colonial rule on its own terms. They formed political parties at continental scale- Pan Africanism under the leadership of African nationalists such Kwame Nkruma from the Gold Coast (Ghana), Samuel Akintola from Nigeria, and Jomo Kenyatta from Kenya. The Pan Africanist movement advocated wider unity of Africans to press for self-rule and to overthrow colonialism (Ojo, 1999).

The common purpose expressed in Pan Africanism was converted into direct action at national level. Each country had within its boundaries nationalist movements dedicated to equality of status and rights, to the pursuit of personal dignity, self-respect and social regeneration. As a result, in 1957, Ghana became the first African country to gain independence, followed by other African state from 1960, the year that became known as the year of Africa's independence. However, after its independence, Africa experienced administrative problems, as most of the leaders were incompetent to govern. As a result there was a prevalence of authoritarian regimes, and single party state throughout Africa, which violated and abused human rights, and subjected it masses to severe oppression. These regimes were further perpetuated by the United States and Soviet Union's support during the cold war that sought to establish spheres of influence within Africa. In pursuit of this aim these super powers were willing to reward compliant regimes with both economic and military hardware, even if, those regimes chose to act in an oppressive manner towards their domestic populations (Coleman, 1998).

Many of Africa's more authoritarian leaders such as Mobutu Sese Seko of the former republic of Zaire (Democratic Republic of the Congo) and Mohamed Siad Barre of Somalia were happy to exploit this situation to the full and to market their strategic importance in exchange for foreign support and for regime survival. The end of the cold war in the 1980's transformed the external environment in which African political systems operated, the end of Soviet interest in Africa and the collapse of Communism discredited

socialistic and static models of government. The movement away from authoritarianism and towards democracy in Eastern Europe had a spill over effect in other parts of the world that had seen the demise of undemocratic rule. By the end of the 1980's Africa's authoritarian regimes and single party states were looking increasingly anachronistic in the light of changes elsewhere in the world. International environment provided less supportive context for authoritarianism, leading to the chronic failure of economic development in most African states, which were totally reliant on international aid and donor support. Therefore, pressures to democratize were exerted both externally and internally (Bayart, 1998).

Externally a number of western governments and international financial institutions such as the World Bank (WB), International Monetary Fund (IMF), and the World Trade Organization (WTO) began to insist that development aid and investment had to be linked to political reform in Africa. Thus, aid had conditionality in a form of structural adjustment programmes (SAPs) that meant that aid had to be couple with economic reform and political plurality. The fundamental concept of conditionality was that aid and investment should be withheld from African governments, which abused human rights and denied political freedoms to their citizens until such time as these abuses were removed. This conditionality was also specifically linked to democratization and good governance (Ojo, 1999).

Domestically, there was a development of pro-democracy movements of most African states that represented a remarkable coalescence of political

participation by all levels of society from elite to mass level. At elite level, pressure came from educated groups who had managed to retain, or were able assert some degree of autonomy from state control. Church leaders were especially prominent in a good number of cases. Enjoying a high level of popular respect in highly religious African societies, church leaders also had the organizational advantages of belonging to well-established institutions. In the more highly authoritarian African states, church congregations often represented one of the few legal ways of bringing people together in large numbers: the "political sermon" became common in the transitional period. Professional associations, especially organized by lawyers, medical staff and academics, played an important role in the pressure for political reform.

Members of these associations, along with student, journalist, trade unions and mass based political actions, were often prominent in large number of groups to promote the linked causes of democracy and human rights. A combination of all these levels of society was instrumental in paving the way for the new atmosphere of political pluralism. Thus, the period since the end of the 1980s political systems of most African states have undergone a remarkable and unprecedented transformation. At the beginning of 1989 there were a handful of African states that were relatively democratic, competitive multi-party systems, whilst the majority was still ruled by the Authoritarianism of single party, military regimes or Apartheid, as was the case in South Africa (Hylop, 1999).

South Africa was among the last African countries to democratize and the late 1980's apartheid was still rife and anti-apartheid groups such the African National Congress (ANC) existed underground or in exile. South Africa is a country blessed with an abundance of natural resources including fertile farmlands and unique mineral resources. South African mines are world leaders in the production of diamonds and gold as well as strategic metals such as platinum. As a result of the availability of these metals, South Africa became vulnerable to invasions.

The English and Dutch colonized South Africa in the 17th century. English domination of the Dutch Descendents (known as the Boers or Afrikaners) resulted in Dutch establishing the new colonies of Orange Free State (Bloemfontein) and Transvaal. The discovery of diamonds in these lands around the 1900 resulted in an English invasion that sparked the Boer war. Following independence from England, an uneasy power sharing between the two groups held sway until 1948 when the Afrikaner National Party was able to gain strong majority. Strategists in the National Party invented Apartheid as a means to cement their control over the economic and social systems (Huntington, 1991).

Initially, the aim of Apartheid was to maintain white domination while extending racial separation. Starting in the 1960's, plan of "Grand Apartheid" was executed, emphasizing territorial separation and police repression. In the course of the last three centuries, the black majority populations were segregated and subjected to all forms of political and economic discrimination.

With the enactment of Apartheid laws in 1948, racial discrimination was institutionalized. Race laws touched every aspect of social life including a prohibitation of marriage between non-whites and Whites, and the sanctioning of white only jobs. The Group Areas Act of 1950 mandated geographic separation in business and residences between people of different colors and races. Likewise, the Population Registration act classified the population in four racial categories- White, Colored, Asiatic and Bantu. Apartheid laws such as these intensified in subsequent years (Coleman, 1998).

Non-compliance with the race laws was dealt with harshly. All Blacks were required to carry "Pass books" containing fingerprints, photos and information on access to non- Black areas. In 1951, the Bantu Authorities Act established a basis for ethnic government in African reserves, known as "homelands". These homelands were independent states, which each African state was assigned by the government according to the record of origin, which was frequently inaccurate. All the political rights, including voting, held by an African were restricted to the designated homelands. The idea was that they would be citizens of homelands losing their citizenship in South Africa and any right of involvement with the South African parliament, which held complete hegemony to over the homelands. From 1976- 1981, four of these homelands were created, denationalizing nine million South Africans. Africans living in homelands needed passports to enter South Africa: aliens in their own country (Howarth & Norval, 1998).

Apartheid became a source of conflict; it was a system of brutality maintained by force and terror. A racialised authoritarian order, by necessity, requires the use of violent coercion, with security forces serving the state rather than the law, willing to employ maximum force as a first resort- as witnessed in the murder of and torture of political detainees, and the infamous massacre such as the sharpeville (1960) and Uitenhage (1985). Hence, those who protested against it (political or non violent protest) were dealt with harshly. In 1960, a large group of Blacks in Sharpville refused to carry their passes; the government declared a state of emergency. The emergency lasted for 156 days, leaving 69 people dead and 187 people wounded. Criminal enforcement laws were passed, which empowered the government to declare stringent states of emergency and increased penalties for protesting against or supporting the repeal of a law. The white regime had no intention of changing the unjust laws of Apartheid. Prominent political parties that were fighting apartheid such as the ANC (African National Congress) and PAC (Pan-Africanist Congress) were outlawed and thousands of activists connected to both groups were arrested.

However, the Sharpville Massacre had a number of profound effects on the future of mass movement against apartheid. First, it drew international attention to South Africa's apartheid policies and inspired the world community's gradual isolation of South Africa. Second, it marked the end of an era of mostly non-violent resistance to the White minority government (De villers, 1993).

The government clampdown led the political leaders of movements opposing apartheid to conclude that public protest alone would not succeed in wakening the apartheid regime. The ANC, for example, moved its operations underground and in 1961 it took up arms against the government with the formation of a secret military arm, the Umkhonto we Siwe (The spear of the Nation) known as "Mk", headed by Mandela. In its first 18 months the MK conducted some 200 acts of sabotage resulting in even harsher repression by the government. Mk headquarters were raided, which led to the arrest of its leaders, and to the 1963 Rivonia Trial at which MK leadership, Mandela included, were charged with high treason. A crime, which could have been punishable by death during apartheid, but these leaders got a lighter sentence (under the circumstances) and were sent to prison for life. The reminder of the 1960's saw the emergence of a big challenge to the anti-Apartheid movement because of the outlawing of the major resistance groups (Price, 1991).

In the late 1960's South Africa saw the beginning of the Black Consciousness movement that was initiated by Black university students led by Steve Biko. This new generations of activists, working with Trade Unions, dominated the resistance in the 1970's and 1980's. In addition to the mobilization of Blacks, there were many other individuals and groups that were actively resisting apartheid (Butler, 2001).

In response to and in spite of the resistance efforts, the Apartheid system grew stronger and its grip was extended over all aspects of life. In the early 1970's, the government's color ban on freedom of travel and work began to

reverberate within South African economy. Prices for basic foods and staple items rose sharply making it even more difficult for Blacks to survive. Blacks were also relegated to a standardized, inferior "Bantu education," and higher education was segregated, and several separate universities were established following an ideology of "separate development" propounded by Hendrick Verwoerd, who was one of the ministers in government.

Worker and student strikes broke out in 1973 in Durban and later spilled over to other parts of the country. The renewed protest exploded into riots in June 1976 after government attempted to force Black children in Soweto to study Afrikaans, the White Afrikaner language. Tens of thousands of high school students took to the streets. Police opened fire on the marching students, triggering a nation-wide uprising that left over 1,000 people dead. The student protests breathed new life into the struggle, and underground structures began to re-emerge to encourage mass support for the demonstrations by linking student effort to the broader struggle for national liberation. The regime responded with swift brutality, attempting to quell each strike, protest, and violent outburst and re-establish control. Nevertheless, an increasingly restless population accelerated their demands for civil rights, improved education, universal suffrage, and the elimination of job limitations, urban segregation and the pass laws. Mounting international pressure combined with domestic turmoil to yield some governmental steps toward reform. However, pressures for reform intensified both internally and externally, South Africa was banned from the common wealth and trade unions and the civil society continued to demonstrate, as a result, the National government could not handle the

pressure any more and succumbed to growing demands for political reform and structural economic adjustment (Tucker, & Scott, 1996).

In 1989, F.W. de Klerk replaced South Africa's long-term president P.W. Botha. De Klerk set about more aggressively dismantling the structures of apartheid. The following year, in 1990, he lifted the 30-year ban on the political parties and granted freedom to political dissidents including ANC leader Nelson Mandela. Parliament began the repeal of more than 100 pieces of racist legislation that had formed the official backbone of the apartheid system. Formal negotiations with the government took place at the Convention for a Democratic South Africa (CODESA) began in order to construct a plan for a future democracy. These negotiations continued until an agreement was reached about the establishment of an elected constitutional assembly that will develop a new constitution for the country. In April 1994, for the first time in South African history all races voted in democratic elections, the major opposition party the ANC won the election that signaled the end of apartheid and the beginning of a new dispensation (http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/pages/frontline/shows/mandela/teach.htm).

Even with a reasonable settlement on power, and a plan for managed democratization, democracy in South Africa was still faced with some inherent perils. There was lack of trust between former antagonists; emotions were strong; in a sense that the previous disadvantaged community felt that the perpetrators were not held accountable for their action. Some felt that justice has not been served and the former government were agonizing about their

loss and could not envision their future. As a result the new South African government was faced with the challenge of reconciling a deeply divided society. Therefore in 1995, the Parliament in South Africa established a commission known as the Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC) to investigate gross human abuses by all sides to the conflict. This commission was established under the promotion of National unity and reconciliation act, signed by the then President, Mr. Mandela (Lodge, 1995).

The South African truth and reconciliation commission placed emphasis on the value of truth telling for social and national reconciliation. The argument is that, by uncovering the facts about the past abuses and the wider set of factors and conditions causing them, and hearing stories about the suffering and the harm caused, individuals and society can find closure and the process of reconciliation and healing can take place (Galtung in Abu-Nimur, 2001).

The TRC had unique features including individual amnesty; which provided an incentive for perpetrators to contribute information. If they failed to apply for amnesty, and disclose their actions – they risked prosecution. Amnesty applications came in large numbers, from convicted criminals to perpetrators of apartheid, that is, military personnel, police, and people affiliated with liberation forces, who had actually committed the crimes. The TRC gave both the victims and perpetrators a chance to come forward and tell their side of the story, share their experiences and to do so publicly. The aim was that the entire society should know the extent of human rights violations committed during the conflict of the past, and the suffering caused to victims on all sides.

Victims had to come forward and publicly give an account of the trauma they suffered, while perpetrators publicly acknowledged their wrongdoing. To many, the opportunity to relate the stories of their trauma and have it form part of the public account of the past was valuable in itself. By giving the victims a public platform to tell their story, the truth commission functioned as a therapeutic process, providing victims with closure.

The broadcasted hearings spread the knowledge and acknowledgement of the apartheid's atrocities through out the South African society and the TRC was generally successful in limiting the range of permissible lies about the past. A truth commission cannot create reconciliation or create peace, but it created conditions that made reconciliation and peaceful coexistence possible. Reconciliation is a precondition for, or an integral aspect of, democratization in the sense that democratic consolidation requires and involves the forging of a significant degree of national reconciliation.

(Christy, 2000).

South Africans today as a result, enjoy unprecedented levels of political freedom, greatly improved human rights record, freedom of speech and expression and unparalleled levels of economic growth. South Africa has become a model of multi-racial government and racial coexistence in an area of the world where not too long ago white colonial governments violently oppressed black majorities. Also, South Africa is regarded worldwide as a good example of a peaceful transition from authoritarian to a democratic government and has unlike many other African countries, managed to promote harmony and peaceful coexistence without any signs of regression. The study

therefore seeks to investigate what role democratization has played in securing sustainable peace and conflict resolution in South Africa (Wiseman, 1995).

1.2 Statement of the problem

The research problem is expressed through the following questions:

- What are the causes of conflict in South Africa?
- What is the role of democratization in conflict resolution and peace building?
- What is the impact of democratization on the socio-economic development of South Africa?

1.3 Rationale of the study

The study was motivated by the realization that there has been a limited investigation on the subject of democratization and the promotion of peace in Africa. South Africa is today a good example of peaceful democratic transition in Africa- that, democratisation is possible in Africa and might yield peaceful coexistence, c ultural a nd racial harmony. It was therefore important that a research was conducted to further investigate the role played by democratization in the promotion of peace building and conflict resolution in Africa.

1.4 Aim of the Study

To investigate the role of demcratisation in conflict resolution and peace building with specific focus on South Africa.

1.5 Objectives of the Study

The study will investigate the following specific aspects:

- The causes of conflict in South Africa.
- The role of democratisation in conflict resolution and peace building.
- The impact of democratisation on the socio-economic development of South Africa.

1.6 Significance of the Study

The study will not only benefit Southern African governments but it will benefit all the African governments and stakeholders who are interested in the consolidation of democracy and sustaining peace through out the continent. The study will also serve as a pioneer in the investigation of the relationship between democratization, peace building and conflict resolution.

1.7 Hypothesis

Democratization in South Africa tends to play a positive role in promoting peace building and conflict resolution. The existing policies or strategies in the study area seem likely to address the socio-economic imbalances that mainly the cause of violent behaviour and conflict in southern Africa.

1.8 Methodology

This was a case study about the role of the democratization in conflict resolution and peace building in South Africa. The researcher chose the case study method in order to develop an in depth understanding of the research problem.

1.9 Instruments

The study used document analysis, and interviews to further investigate the problem. The latter method was used so as to accommodate respondents who are not able to read or write.

1.10 Subjects

Sources of information for the study included the following:

Key persons

- A representative of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission
- Political analysts

Secondary sources

- Journal articles, reports, books, newspaper articles or any other document on the subject will be used.

1.11 Methods of data collection

The study used both primary and secondary data to gather information. Primary data collection methods included the following: - observation with inside, and interviews. Observation with inside was used because all knowledge was not gained by means of studying the past records. We learn by observing the events taking place around us. Historical data are static, records remain records but events are fleeting. What happens in the public square today will never be exactly repeated. Live processes contain conformity and uniformity and we are able to judge from what has happen

from any fleeting moment, what may happen again. The researcher, by drawing conclusion from one transitory collection of data may extrapolate what is like to happen again under similar circumstances. Interviews were used to acquire more information, through unstructured interviews with open-ended questions that allowed or granted the respondents an opportunity to elaborate their answers. While secondary data was obtained particularly through literature review. This was done to compensate the information that respondents might have ommitted or that they were less enlightened about.

1.12 Data analysis

Qualitative method of data analysis was used. The researcher used qualitative methods in order to investigate what other authors have written about the subject and to analyse the content of the research.

1.13 Procedure

These were the steps that the researcher followed to reach the sources of information: -

- The researcher made appointments with the relevant departments and conducted the interviews.

1.14 Limitation of the study

The method of analysis used led to researcher bias because qualitative methods are generally subjective in nature; qualitative methods also made it difficult for the researcher to generalize due to its small-scale nature; and

budget constrains impeded on researchers' mobillity and the interviewing of key respondents in different parts of the country.

1.15 Ethical consideration

The researcher ensured that there is informed consent, that is, the researcher made sure that the participants were aware of both the positive or negative aspects or consequences of participation, in order to ensure co-operation. The researcher also ensured that the information provided by the respondents was kept confidential, by assuring the them that the information given would only be used for the stated purpose of the research and that no other person will have access to it.

1.16 Definition of concepts

Democratization is a process that aims at the establishment of democratic political regimes. It refers to the strengthening of both popular participation in the exercise of power and the accountability of government to those they govern. Democracy involves rule by the people through periodic elections of their highest leaders in which all adults can participate, for which office they are eligible, and under the rule of law. Conditions that must prevail in a democratic country includes among others, multi-party - open competition for political office, popularly and regularly elected legislature and head of government, freedom of speech and expression, religious freedom, press freedom and a National constitution that structure the government and elaborate the reciprocal rights and duties of the government and the people,

which all the governing officials and their policies must obey (Sorensan, 1993).

Peace building refers to successfully ending the divisions that lead to war, healing the social wounds created by war, and creating a society where the differences among social groups are resolved through compromise rather than violent conflict. It is a set of strategies designed to promote a secure and stable lasting peace in which the basic human needs of the population are met and violent conflicts do not recur. This definition incorporates both "negative peace and positive peace. Negative peace-which is the absence of physical violence, and Positive peace- which is the capacity to deal with conflict non-violently and creatively. Where there is a fair and equal distribution of resources among different societal groupings (Galtung, 2001).

Conflict resolution is a process that takes a wider view of timing intervention, it seks to address and resolve the deep-rooted sources of conflict before an armed conflict has broken out. Violent behaviours and the hostile attitudes that arise as a result of a contradiction between conflicting groups are dealt with until the structure of the conflict is transformed. However, efforts to resolve conflicts should be maintained even in the heat of battle where the key actors would participate in conflict resolution process such as, peace keeping, peace making, peace building and prevention (Miall, 2001).

Reconciliation is a process of healing the traumas of both victims and perpetrators after violence, providing closure of the bad relations. It also focuses on the involvement of two parties in an interaction of the apology forgiveness and willingness to embark on a new relationship based on acceptance and truth. The process prepares the parties for relations with justice and peace (Lampen, 2000).

Coexistence is an agreement between people of different political and social systems, living in mutual toleration. That is people are willing to endure or permit others with different customs, beliefs or values to exist without condemnation or persecution (Galtung, 2001).

1.17 Theoretical Perspective

Liberalism and Democracy

Some of the main proponents of liberalism include among others Immanuel Kant and John Rawls. Central to liberalism are democracy and interdependence. Liberalist argue that democracies rarely if ever fight each other because democracies are a system of dispersed power, and dispersed power means multiple vet points and groups that could block war. Democracies function through compromise, non-violence, and respect for law. To the extent that these values and habit govern foreign policy, they are conducive to peace. South Africa as a democratic country also places rule of law at the top of its agenda, in its constitution it clearly states that no one is

above the law, and that people should be treated with respect and human dignity.

The South African government further ensures that no violence within or against the state will be tolerated, through the creation of proper, non-discriminating and impartial judicial system. A perfect example of this was when the Boeremag (the Afrikaner right wingers) tried to discredit the government and to carry out vicious racial attacks on the Black community. The Police and the National Intelligence made it they mission to bring this to an end and the perpetrators were arrested. A similar case is also that of Mark Thatcher who contravened South Africa's Foreign Military Assistance Act by funding the mercenaries who wanted to topple the government in Equatorial Guinea. The South African foreign military act clearly stipulates that no person may within the Republic or elsewhere recruit, use or train persons for or finance or engage in mercenary activity. If any South African citizen is involved in organizing a coup, the government will not be liable for any thing that happens to that individual(s), if they are arrested in that country (http://projects.sipri.se/expcon/natexpcon/Safrica/formilass.htm).

Proponents of this theory believe that the power rests with the general public and this is one other reason why democracies are less likely to go to war. Thus, if a country goes to war, those who hold ultimate authority (the general public) will pay the price. South Africa uses universal suffrage to ensure that the public is granted the power to take part in the decision-making processes that affect their lives. They do this by electing representatives that represent

their views, needs and want in the parliament, and ensure that those demands will be met.

Liberalists also assert that, the high level of economic and interdependence among democratic states facilitate a common identity that makes it less likely for liberal states to fight each other. They continue to say that free trade is "God's diplomacy and there is no other certain way of uniting people in bonds of peace", implying that, if goods cannot cross borders, armies will. Liberalists argue that extensive economic intercourse allows states to gain by trade the wealth that they would other wise seek through fighting. Democracy in South Africa made it possible for the country (South Africa) to form trade relations with countries that previously were not interested in making such relation it, due to its oppressive policies that were enforced by the apartheid system. South Africa today, as a result of it being a democracy, has managed to forge trade ties with countries both locally and internationally. One of the most recent trade treaties signed with South Africa being that of a bilateral agreement on Skills transfer and trade with Japan. These theorists maintain that if all states were liberal democracies, peace would prevail (Jervis, 1999).

Realism and democracy

The realists theory of democracy opine that democracy should be seen as referring to the systems of government now in place in the major western societies rather than an abstract ideal against which those systems could be measured and perhaps found wanting. What makes these systems democratic on this view is that they each represent a viable form of popular government, one that it is appointed by and ultimately answerable to the people themselves.

South Africa aligns itself with this view of a democracy in a sense that, the people to whom they remain answerable chose its government. Participation of the majority in South Africa is, however, mainly limited to elections. A view that is held by realists and believe that it can enhance modern representative democracy and make it viable.

Realists assert that representative government are made viable by the fact that participation of the people in their own government is nevertheless limited, in part by the practical impossibility of direct democracy in the government of large populations. The latter point in particular leads many realists to insist that the restrictions of popular participation is in fact a good thing, and that any attempt to expand participation to beyond its present limits would be detrimental to good government. In realist account of democracy, popular participation is regarded on the one hand as necessary and on the other as potentially so destructive that it must be kept strictly within bounds. Thus, one of the most important reason why modern representative democracy is thought to be viable is that, for an overwhelming majority of the population, participation is limited to elections, while for the active minority, it is channeled through a range of competing parties, movements and pressure groups. Hence, in the South African context the majority is represented by the active minority such as trade unions, political parties, and religious organizations that serve to stimulate political debate on competing societal interest, a debate that in turn feeds into the policy making process and, in principle permits the government to device policies and practices that reflect shifting public attitudes (Hindness, 1995).

1.18 Literature Review

Democratization involves building democratic institutions and practices and deepening democratic values in societies. Programming for democratic development includes a range of activity areas, which reinforce each other as they work toward a common end. The implementation of free, fair multiparty elections is often the first step in this process; a democratic outcome is reinforced by an effective legislature, supported by strong constitutional and procedural frameworks and sustained by capable legislators; representative democracy gains legitimacy and stability when it actively consult with non-government stakeholders who have the capacity to effectively participate in the political process; a free media can simultaneously challenge public action while serving as both an alternate information source and an educational tool (Rummel, 1994).

Democracy requires a politically active and involved citizenry, or what some commentators call a vibrant "civil society," to counterbalance and scrutinize the power of state and to provide channels for political expression. An energetic civil society is characterized by a profusion of citizen organizations and associations, such as unions, churches, political parties and movements, cooperatives, neighborhoods, and schools of thought. The existence of these organizations presupposes sustained mobilization on the part of a large number of citizens and serves to stimulate political debate by catalyzing competing societal interests- a debate that, in turn feeds into the policymaking process and, in principle, permits democratic governments to devise policies

and practices that reflect shifting public attitudes. Thus, this implies that, in democratic countries political conflict is not merely normal, it is generally thought to be rather healthy (Baker, 2003).

Why democratization?

One argument is that people are all in nature equal, that it is a natural right that people govern themselves, that they be free in a democratic sense. Since each person is an individual with free will and is equal in this sense to any other individual, the only system of natural governance is the one in which all individuals collectively rule themselves. Another argument is that democracy is the social contract to which people in a state of nature would agree collectively had they no fore knowledge as to how they would personally benefit (as in gaining or losing property). Democracy creates the greatest happiness of the greatest number; it promotes economic and personal development; public policy is most effective because of its incremental nature and the feedback of democratic elections; people are freer and minorities better protected; equality promoted and enhanced; it enables gradual and incremental revolutionary change. But especially important here is the argument is that democracy institutionalizes a means of non- violent conflict resolution- the willingness to negotiate, compromise, and debate, rather than fight. Moreover, the ballot rather than the bullet is the very democratic ideal of voting to resolve differences and chose leaders.

Empirical research support this argument, especially well established is the finding that democracies do not make war on each other, the more democracy the less likely to violent rebellion, revolution, civil war, bloody riots, anti-

government terrorism, and such. Also, democratic leaders generally do not kill their own people through genocide; massacre, extra judicial executions; and other forms of mass murder (Huntington, 1991).

Democratization is important because of one of the most widely (but not universally) accepted trends in international relations, known as democratic peace. Democracy allows people or others to settle their disputes peacefully. Democratization is particularly important in countries, which have gone through an extended period of intractable conflict. These institutions and value systems that make democracy possible are based on the development of the trust, tolerance and capacity for cooperation that make stable peace and reconciliation possible of a conflict resolution process. Unfortunately, the very same reasons that make democratization important make it difficult to achieve. The ethnic and other tensions that give rise to intractable conflict create so much mistrust and intolerance that cooperation is very difficult to achieve. One exception is with South Africa, where the Black and white political elite summoned up unprecedented political will and commitment to multiracial democracy (Monshipouri, 1995).

Democracy is crucial in building and sustaining peace. Functioning democratic structures are conflict management in action and the democratization process – designing and installing such structures is effective upstream conflict prevention in action: putting in place structures that will manage future conflict peacefully when it arises. Effective democracy building requires, among other things, the inclusion of previously excluded voices,

firstly, through dialogue to design a political system, and then through that political system, channelled specifically via the mechanism of parliament into a decision-making process. Democracy building is a continuous and preventative process: a healthy democracy both manages existing conflict and maintains the structures that protect against any future return to violent conflict (Hauss, 1998).

Democratization is a process of gradually introducing more participatory politics, including elections and the creation of a civil society supportive of tolerance, pluralist politics through adherence to constitutional rules of the game. International mediators in today's civil wars often agree, that democratic solutions are a feasible way to re-create a legitimate system of postwar governance. Whether in failed states such Somalia or protracted wars such as in the Great Lakes region, elections are seen as an immediate way to legitimate a negotiated settlement and establish some semblance of postwar governance. Elections after a civil war are especially risky because the competition for power through the ballot box sharpens social differences-usually along the lines over which the war was fought. At the same time, they seem desirable, even necessary, at some point in postwar reconciliation process. When no side is able to prevail on the battlefield and exhaustion leads the parties to make peace, negotiating with foes and moving towards a new system of non-violent conflict management is the only realistic way out. Democratic institutions establish new rules of the games that may allow for a period of power sharing that involves the principal protagonists in the war in a collective government.

Hopes are pinned in the ballot box replacing the battlefield as the principal way in which social conflicts are waged. In sum, there is simply no more just or legitimate way to peacefully manage differences among contending social groups than democracy, however difficult it may seem to move from violent to electoral competition. Democracy is a system of government that allows for conflict to continue, albeit in institutions such as the parliament and courts rather than on the battlefield. The alternatives to democracy in postwar situations- partition or political divorce, dominance of one group over others, long-term international trusteeship, personal or military- may work to contain differences in the short run, as they have in times past. But over time these alternatives do not offer a legitimate and sustainable method for fostering multi-ethnic consensus and promoting reconciliation (Croaker, 2003).

Differences in the economic, social, and cultural and historical circumstances of the world's societies mean that differences will continue between democracy as viewed by one society and democracy as viewed by another, democracy is increasingly being recognized as a response to a wide range of human concerns and as essential to the protection of human rights. Democracy contributes to preserving peace and security, securing justice and human rights, and promoting economic and social development. Democratic institutions and processes channel competing interests into arenas of discourse and provide means of compromise which can be respected by all participants in debates, thereby minimizing the risk that differences or disputes will erupt into armed conflict or confrontation. Because democratic governments are freely chosen by their citizens and held accountable through periodic and

genuine elections and other mechanisms, they are more likely to promote and respect the rule of law, respect individual and minority rights, cope effectively with social conflict, absorb migrant populations and respond to the needs of marginalized groups. They are therefore less likely to abuse their power against the people of their own state territories. Democracy within states thus fosters the evolution of the social contract upon which lasting peace can be built. In this way, a culture of democracy is fundamentally a culture of peace (Held, 1996).

Democratic institutions and processes within states may likewise be conducive to peace among states. The accountability and transparency of democratic governments to their own citizens- who understandably may be highly cautious about war, as it is they who will have to bear its risks and burdens- may help to restrain recourse to military conflict with other states. The legitimacy conferred on democratically elected governments command the respect of the people of other democratic states and fosters expectations of negotiation, compromise and the rule of law in international relations. When states sharing the a culture of democracy are involved in a dispute, the transparency of their regimes may help to prevent accidents, avoid reactions based on emotions or fear and reduce the likelihood of surprise attack (Anstey, 1999).

Lacking the legitimacy or real support offered by free elections, authoritarian governments all too often take recourse to intimidation and violence in order to suppress internal dissent. They tend to reject institutions such as a free press

and an independent judiciary, which can provide the transparency and accountability necessary to discourage such governmental manipulation of citizens. The resulting atmosphere of oppression and tension, felt in neighboring countries, can heighten the fear of war. It is for this reason that one of the first purposes the democratization process is to take effective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to peace. Threatened by the resentment of their own people, non-democratic governments may also be more likely to incite hostilities against other states in order to justify their suppression of internal dissent or forge a basis for national unity.

It is true that the introduction of democratic practice into formerly authoritarian or war-torn states may contribute to civil conflict by opening channels of free expression, including the expression of hatred. Free and fair elections can be followed by the suppression of those defeated. There is also a danger that strengthening civil society without also addressing state capacity may undermine governability or overwhelm the state. Especially for governments in underdeveloped countries, which are typically engaged full time in the provision of basic needs for their populations, the risk to stability that may arise in the early stages of democratization may make them reluctant to continue democratization or even to begin the process at all (Van Vuuren, 1994).

These difficult questions of prioritization and timing suggest several important lessons. First and foremost, it is essential that each state itself decide the form, the pace and character of its democratization process. This suggests a

fundamental prerequisite for democratization: the existence of a state, which can and is willing not only to create the conditions for free and fair elections, but also to support the development and maintenance of the institutions necessary for the ongoing practice of democratic politics. Second, democratization must begin with an effort to create a culture of democracy- a political culture, which is fundamentally non-violent and in which no one party or group expects to win or lose all the time. Such a culture is built upon a societal consensus not about policy, but about the process and framework of democratic political life: that the will of the people is the basis of governmental authority; that all individuals have a right to take part in government; that there shall be periodic and genuine elections; that the power changes hands through popular suffrage rather than intimidation or force; that political opponents and minorities have a right to express their views; and that there can be loyal and legal opposition to the government in power. Third, democratization must seek to achieve institutional balance between the state and civil society.

Finally, support for democratization must be coupled with support for development in order that socio-economic as well as civil and political rights are respected. Although development can take place without democracy, there is no evidence that the breakthrough to development require an Authoritarian regime. There is, ample evidence to suggesting that over the long term, democracy is an ingredient for both sustainable development and lasting peace. Moreover, the globalization of economic activity and communications has generated pressure for democratization and the respect of human rights (Butler, 2001).

In today's world, freedom of thought, the impetus to creativity and the will to involvement are all critical to economic, social and cultural progress, and they are best fostered and protected within democratic systems. In this sense, the economic act of privatization can be as well a political act, enabling greater human creativity and participation. The best way to cultivate a citizen's readiness to participate in the development of his or her country, to arouse that person's energy, imagination and commitment, is by recognizing and respecting human dignity and human rights. The material means of progress can be acquired, but human resources- skilled, spirited and inventive workers- is indispensable, as I the enrichment found through mutual dialogue and the free interchange of ideas. In this way, a culture of democracy, marked by communication, dialogue and openness to the ideas and activities of the world, helps to foster a culture of development.

Democracy is not the affirmation of the individual at the expense of the community, it is through democracy that individual and collective rights, the rights of persons and the right of people, can be reconciled. Many different balances can be struck between the rights of individuals and the rights of the community within the context of democratic politics. Democratic processes are the most reliable way to ensure that these balances are genuinely reflective of the people's broader culture, which, in every society, must itself serve as the ballast for the healthy functioning of democracy (Horowitz, 1995).

Democracy today is receiving widespread acknowledgement for it capacity to foster good governance, which is perhaps the single most important development variable within the control of individual states. By providing legitimacy for government and encouraging people's participation in decision-making on the issues that affect their lives, democratic processes contribute to the effectiveness of the state policies and development strategies. Democratic institutions and practices foster the governmental accountability and transparency necessary to deter national and transnational crime and corruption and encourage increased responsiveness to popular concerns. In development, they increase the likelihood that the state goals reflect broad societal concerns and that the government is sensitive to the societal and environmental costs of its development policies.

Non-democratic states over time tend to generate conditions inimical to development: politicized military rule; a weak middle class; a population constrained to silence; prohibitions on travel; censorship; restrictions on the practice of religion or imposition religious obligation; and pervasive and often institutionalized corruption. Without democratic institutions to channel popular pressures for development and reform, popular unrest and instability will result. The reality is that no state can long remain just or free- thus also have the potential to pursue a successful and sustainable development strategy- if its citizens are prohibited from participating actively and substantially in its political processes and economic, social and cultural development. Increasingly, it is from this perspective that democracy is being seen today- as a practical necessity (Mhone & Edigheji, 2003

CHAPTER TWO

Conflict is a clash of interests, values, actions or directions. Conflict refers to the existence of that clash. The word conflict is applicable from the instant that the clash occurs. Even if one says that there is a potential conflict that person is implying that there is already a conflict of direction even though a clash may not yet have occurred. Conflict is caused by a contradiction that occurs as a result of actual or perceived incompatibility of goals between conflicting parties, generated by different or a mismatch between social values and social structure.

This contradiction then leads to the development different attitudes that include the parties' perceptions and misperceptions of each other and of themselves, and these hostile attitudes leads to negative stereotyping, that often result in violent behaviour. Conflict then, can be viewed as a dynamic process in which the structure, attitudes, and behaviour are constantly changing and influencing one another (Miall & Ramotham, 2001).

THE CAUSES OF CONFLICT IN SOUTH AFRICA

The way a society is organized can create both the root causes of conflict and suitable conditions in which it is likely to occur. Any society which is organized so that its people are treated unequally and unjustly as was the case in apartheid South Africa, is likely to erupt into conflict, especially where leaders do not represent all the members of that society. If unequal and unfair representation is reformed, then the conflicts will be rare. Human beings have basic needs. Everyone needs to be recognized as an individual with a personal identity; everyone needs to be able to feel safe. If these needs are not met people protest,

and protesting can lead to rebellion and violence. Many people value their identity and security in their cultural groupings and its particular point of view-stereotypes between different cultural groups also lead to disputes that can easily turn violent. Unless people learn to understand that their differing cultures are not inevitably a threat to the other, they will also learn how to manage their differences co-operatively and peacefully. One aspect of culture is particularly important: it can create a language and belief system that excludes people, creating "Us/Them", "Insider/Outsider" situations and using language for discrimination, intolerance and hate. If people create a society that does not regard "differences" and "diversity" as problems but as valuable for social growth, many conflicts could disappear (de Bono, 1996).

At the core of the South African conflict were the deep-rooted divisions affecting parties' fundamental interests, needs, and values. These included irreconcilable moral values, matters of justice and human rights, high stakes distributional issues, unmet human needs, and issues of identity.

2.1 Issues of justice

The desire for justice is one that people tend to be unwilling to compromise, assertion of injustice often lead to conflict. An individual's sense of justice is connected to the norms, rights, and entitlement that are thought to underlie decent human treatment. If there is a perceived discrepancy between what a person obtains, what he/she wants, and what he/she believes is entitled to he/she may come to believe that he /she is being deprived of the benefit he/she deserves. This can occur when either a procedure or outcome is viewed as

unfair. When people believe that they have been treated unfairly, they try to "get even" or challenge those who have treated them unjustly. The apartheid system made blacks in South Africa to be ridiculed and discriminated; it made feel like aliens in their own country. Blacks were denied the right to vote- to be part of the decision processes that affected their lives, they were sentenced with out trials, tortured and denied freedom of movement, exposed to inferior quality of education (Bantu education) and limited job opportunities. Indeed, this sense of injustice motivated aggression and retaliation. Black South Africans came to view violence as the only way to address the injustices they were suffering and ensure that their fundamental needs are met. This was because there were no procedures in place to correct the oppressive social structures or bring about retributive or restorative justice (Harris & Reilly, 1998).

However, the apartheid government often responded by attempting to quell the disturbance and maintain the status quo. This has led to ongoing violent conflict. Those who benefited from the injustice often perpetuated it, often without being aware that they are contributing to injustice. Not surprisingly, victims were typically more sensitive to injustice than victimizers. What seemed fair to one person was not fair to another, and these perceptions were affected by self-interest. However, blacks spoke of justice in absolute terms, as some independent and objective standard of fairness that can be used to determine who is right. They rebelled against the system and demanded the establishment of a fair and impartial judicial system, equality before the law

and a democratic constitution stating the rights and privileges of all South Africans regardless of race.

Blacks who have been victims of injustice or unfair treatment grew extremely angry and felt justified to seek justice using whatever means possible or at their disposal (Bekker &Carlton, 1996).

2.2 Rights

Violations of political and economic rights of the black majority populations was among the root causes of the conflict in South Africa, which in turn generated further human rights abuses. When rights to adequate food, housing, employment and cultural life are denied, and large groups of people excluded from the society's decision making processes, there is likely to be great social unrest. Such conditions often gave rise to justice conflicts, in which parties' demands that their basic needs be met. The apartheid government denied the black population their civil rights, including the right to privacy, fair trial, and freedom of movement. The violation of these rights further sparked the conflict in South Africa. The government was extremely militarized, and the police and judicial systems were terribly corrupted. Abductions, arbitrary arrests, detentions without trials, political executions, assassinations and torture became part of the daily activities (Annan, 1998).

2.3 Unmet human needs

Lack of provision of fundamental human needs was another cause of conflict in South Africa. These included basic human needs for food, water, and shelter as well as more complex needs for safety, security, self-esteem, and

personal fulfillment. These more complex needs center on the capacity to exercise choice in all aspects of one's life and to have one's identity and cultural values accepted as legitimate. The need for both distributive justice and the ability to participate in civil society are also crucial. All of these needs are fundamental requirements for human development. Thus, while interests can be negotiated when they come into conflict, needs cannot. Various types of structural violence jeopardize individual' physical safety and security. Poverty, environmental degradation, poor health care, and lack of adequate housing often lead to the denial of their basic needs for dignity, safety, and control over their lives. Because all individuals are driven to fulfill these essential needs, black South Africans were determined to they fight indefinitely to achieve them and would not give up until their goal was attained (Anstey, 1999).

2.4 Identity issues

Identity was one of the fundamental human needs that underlay the South African conflict. Apartheid South Africa made the Black population group to feel that their sense of self is threatened or denied legitimacy and respect, thus identity became a conflictual issue. This is because, identity is integral to one's self-esteem and how one interprets the rest of the world, any threat to identity is likely to produce a strong response. Typically this response is both aggressive and defensive. Conflict in South Africa was maintained by the development of polarized collective identities among group members. Group memberships formed along the lines of nationality, race, and religion. Individuals identified with those in their own group and began to organize

against those in the opposing group. Collective identities were formed around issues such as resisting oppressive social structures. The white racial groups become increasingly polarized and developed hostility towards the blacks, who were viewed as the out-group. A high level of group identification, together with a high degree of perceived threats from the white population, led to a basic impulse among the blacks to preserve their identity by trying to destroy the opponent, which was the apartheid system.

Identity became the primary issue in the South African racial conflict. This conflict centered on matters of security, fair treatment, and a sense of control over one's life. These identity-based concerns were tied to fundamental human needs; conflicts surrounding identity often threatened groups' very existence. Identity conflict was based on people's psychology, culture, basic values, shared history, and beliefs. These tended to be more abstract and were connected to groups' basic needs for survival (Coleman, 1998).

In addition, rigid collective identities made it more difficult for groups to compromise. The white government felt that the blacks posed a threat to their authority or legitimacy, as a result they lashed out; passed discriminatory laws that made it very difficult for blacks to survive. For instance, they controlled the movement of the black people by imposing pass laws that they had to carry wherever they went, came up with restrictive curfews for blacks that made it unlawful to be seen in the city during certain hours of the day, and even public toilets were separated on the basis of race. Those in the out-group (blacks) were excluded, which limited contact between identity groups and contributed to the development of negative stereotypes and intergroup violence. Whites

viewed the other racial groups as evil or even nonhuman and regarded their views and feelings as unworthy of attention. Because merely sitting down with those with a different racial background was seen, as a threat to the whites' identity, even beginning efforts at resolving the differences was extremely difficult. Further more, the negation of the opposing group often becomes a fundamental aspect of one's own identity. During the apartheid regime, for example, an important aspect of identity for the white minority was being anti-black (Harris & Reilly, 1998).

The issue of identity is grounded in nationalism. Nationalism as an ideology affirms the existence of peoples or nations whose members share a common history and destiny. Nationalist sentiments often led whites to see their own group as superior to the other racial groups. This has also led to group members to denigrate or dominate other groups. Because any challenges to one's nation was regarded as a threat to its very existence. Nationalism was one of the main sources that made the conflict in South Africa intractable. Identity issues, nationalism and racism typically involved a history of colonialism and emerge out of history of domination and perceived injustice. Colonization, in particular, often had serious socio-economic and moral implications that persisted. It was a system that perpetuated severe imbalances of power; the more powerful party exploited or abused the less powerful party. Hence, the blacks were denied effective political participation or lacked opportunities for cultural expression. When their identity was denied or simply unrecognized by the white government, blacks recognized these power hierarchies as unjust and rebelled against them (Price, 1991).

2.5 Distributional issues

The apartheid system institutionalized the uneven social distribution of resources in South Africa, which caused serious structural scarcity for blacks. Land ownership was tightly restricted in both urban and rural areas, curtailing economic advancement. Unequal access to land affected 15 million blacks living in the homelands or as tenants and laborers on "white" land. In 1980s, 95 percent of the black population earned less than 600 dollars per month, whereas 89 percent of the white population earned more. With an average disposable income of approximately 950 rand a year – one-sixteenth the white average – homeland farmers in particular could not make the long-term investment necessary to protect their land. Not only did blacks suffer from an imbalanced distribution of the quantity of land, but also they also often received the most marginal productive land. Moreover, under the apartheid regime, structural scarcities of land were often reinforced by stark shortfalls in agricultural inputs, such as capital, fertilizer, veterinary services, and new agricultural technologies.

Structural scarcity of land also existed within the former homelands. Rights to communal land were unevenly distributed among homeland populations: up to 80 percent of production came from 20 percent of the farmers who controlled most of the land. In urban areas black town ships were built on sites not useful to the white community. They were often overcrowded, short of housing, and located downwind from dirty industries. Infrastructure was inferior, with few services such as electricity and running water. Over crowding and poverty meant that new residents built their houses from nonconventional materials

scavenged from local dumps and public buildings; they used mud, grass, and straw from nearby streams, fields, and hillsides, which tended to increase local erosion and flooding damage. In sum, the black population, with little political or economic power in South Africa, was forced to subsist on a severely restricted and eroded land base (www.ppu.org.uk/learn/conflict/st_conflict.html).

Under apartheid, the average populations density of the homelands was 10 times the density of rural "white" South Africa. When labor requirements in commercial agriculture declined, apartheid ensured that black South Africans could not move to cities when they were expelled from rural white areas. Police forcibly removed blacks to the homelands; partly as a result of this forced migration the population of homelands grew drastically but the land area of homelands did not increase. In addition to this in-migration, the homelands experienced high natural population growth rates. The fertility rate for blacks in the 1980's was estimated at 5 children per woman. This was because the apartheid system denied blacks access to proper education, health care, family planning, and secure sources of livelihood- the things that make small families possible and advantageous. Hence, the conflict over the distribution of resources became a major issue in South Africa. The blacks wanted to gain more power and reverse the exploitative relationship, and those in government did not want to give up the benefit associated with their position. The apartheid government was unwilling to compromise and share the resources equally and as a result the conflict exacerbated (De villers, 1993).

CHAPTER THREE

THE ROLE OF DEMOCRATIZATION IN CONFLICT RESOLUTION AND PEACE BUILDING

Democratic consolidation and peace building seem more likely when certain conditions are present, these conditions are: when the polity has geographical, constitutional and political legitimacy; where there is agreement about the rules of the political game and the parties abide by them; where opposing groups agree on policy restraint; where there are low or declining levels of poverty; and where ethnic, cultural, and religious cleavages are not deep and uncompromising.

3.1 Legitimacy

No democratic polity may promote peace or survive for long, that is, it cannot consolidate unless it enjoys some form of legitimacy, whether of passive acceptance kind or whether of the more unusual positive kind. However, the concept legitimacy may be better understood and operationalised if it is broken down into three components: Geographical, constitutional and political legitimacy.

Geographical legitimacy means that those who live within the state accept its territorial definition and appropriateness of their place within it or, at least, they do not positively oppose it, except by constitutional means. Where, for instance, people do not consider the state legitimate in this respect, democratic politics come under threat. In extreme cases the threat might take the form of secessionist or irredentist movement, where a group or region wishes to break

away and establish it own state or join another. Where people have no political means for achieving secession from the state, they are unlikely to abide by democratic processes and violence is inevitable (Bayart, 1998).

Constitutional legitimacy refers to the acceptance of the constitution- that is the formal structure of rules whereby political power is competed for, organized and distributed- though again the range of possible kinds of acceptance needs to be born in mind. One of the toughest parts of the democratization process lies precisely in establishing such a constitution, as the complex negotiations in South Africa between 1990 and 1994 illustrated. As democracies emerge from the political darkness of authoritarian rule, a whole range of interests erupts into the more open but less predictable political space, or stand exposed in it. Some may be powerful and rich and fear change; some may be poor and hitherto weak and demand change. They maybe economic interests (political parties and legislatures), functional interests, ethnic interests (Afrikaners in South Africa), regional interests or a mix of some of them. Each will want to have a shrewd idea of how the new distribution of power in the constitution will affect it, and each will want to ensure that their interests will be protected (Lodge, 1995).

To some extent constitutions can do that, which is why negotiation and bargaining is normally so tough as groups seek to influence the shape of the constitution and what goes into it. Will it be a parliamentary or presidential system? If the latter, how powerful will the presidency be relation to the legislature, and what will the role of political parties be? How will the army be

controlled? and how much power-and resources- will the regions or sub national regional governments have? Will there be a Bill of rights? What will go into it? Will private property be protected as in the new 1996 South African constitution? If so, then the constitution places immediate and far reaching constrains on government options in aspects of, say, economic policy (Leftwich, 1995).

Political legitimacy refers to the extent to which the electorate (or realistically, organized parties in it, or other institutions like the army) regards the government in power as being entitled, procedurally to be there. That is to say, a government may be said to be politically legitimate where the outcome of the elections reflect voting preferences according to the rules and the results have not been rigged. But the point here is that, geographical, constitutional and political forms of legitimacy, are necessary conditions for a democratic polity to survive.

The apartheid government was not legitimate government because the entire South African community did not accept it. They are discriminatory laws and the denial of universal suffrage to the majority of its population made it an illegitimate government. It did not take into consideration any of the above-mentioned conditions; it was a one-sided system of government concerned with maintaining the status quo and remaining in authority. Therefore, the new democratically elected South African government made it its mission to ensure that elections are free and fair; that the constitution equally represents each and protects the rights of every citizen regardless of their colour, race or ethnicity; and ensured that all the discriminatory laws and policies are

abolished and replaced by new and representative ones. Thus reducing the likelihood of conflict and disruptions, and promoting peace (Held, 1996).

3.2 Consensus about the rules of the game

There is need to be a consensus or agreement about the rules of the political games and loyalty to those rules, and to the democratic process itself, especially among political elites, so that democracy can survive and create appropriate environment for peace to prevail. This is because democratic politics involve open competition for power, no group can be certain of wining. Democratization therefore can be said to be a processes that institutionalizes "uncertainty". Indeed, the shift from authoritarian rule to democracy means precisely that the group, which has held power (such as whites in South Africa) abandons effective control over outcomes and thus has to embrace "uncertainty."

This uncertainty has at least two dimensions, both understandable threatening to the group which is giving up control: (a) that it may not win the elections and hence would lose power, and (b) that the policy changes introduced by the new government would damage its interests. The major political parties in South Africa have agreed upon their constitution that, when an election has been judged to have taken place according to the rules of the game (be free and fair), then for democracy to work the losers must abide by the results, thereby show commitment to the democratic process itself. Winners on the other hand must know that they are not in power forever and will have to compete again and put their record to the test in the next elections, which they cannot suspend. The ruling party must commit themselves to effective

demobilization, the ballot box and committee rooms in their struggle for power or for influence over policy (Lodge, 1995).

3.3 Policy restrains by the winning party

It is unlikely that any group or party would accept the rules of the electoral game if losing meant that it or the interests it represented would lose too much. It follows that while they must accept the outcome, winners must also accept that there are significant limits to what they can do with their newly won power. This third condition means that democratic consolidation also depends on the victorious parties exercising policy retrains when in government, although the temptation is often to rewrite the policy book. That is to say, new or born-again democracies are more likely to consolidate and prosper in peace if the new government does not pursue highly contentious policies too far or too fast, especially where these policies threaten other major interests (Leftwich, 1995).

The major political parties in South Africa established the limits on policy change during the course of negotiations on the Convention for a Democratic South Africa before the process of democratic transition was completed. This shows that while the distinction between democratic transition and consolidation is conceptually important, there are also very important continuities between them. That is, what happens in the course of democratization has important consequences for what happens in the future.
They had pursued developmental goals that would benefit everybody including the losing party. For example, the ANC led government in South

Africa has since 1994 been extremely careful not to threaten white economic interests or the interests of capital more generally. Also, the government would not dispossess the wealthy because they wished to sustain the political agreements that will keep peace and democracy going. This is because there has been some form of 'pact' (power sharing agreement) between the elites on the limits of policy change under the new democratic auspices: these were even written into the constitution.

This was also motivated by the fact that the new government did not only seek goodwill but also foreign aid and investment from major western institutions and companies. Such instances might even be threatened if government policies were thought to be too radical or unfriendly to the operation of free markets, a feature of new democracies, which illustrate the continuing salience of external factors even after democratization has been completed. The external forces and international organizations continue to have major impact South Africa's developmental issues because the country's democratization opened the gate way for South Africa to be part of the global village (Sparks, 1995).

3.4 Poverty Eradication

There has been a strong positive correlation between the wealth of a country and democracy, however this does not mean that wealth is the only sufficient condition for democracy. One reason why serious poverty seems to restrain democratic consolidation is that in profoundly poor countries, the struggle for scarce resources, and the enormous advantages which permanent control of the state may bring to a party or faction, makes democracy very unlikely.

Incumbents holding state power will be reluctant to engage in compromise and will be very unwilling to lose control. Suspending democracy becomes a good way of staying in power. Poverty often gives rise to what is often called the 'politics of the belly.' Moreover, poverty is often accompanied by low levels of literacy, formal education and communication, none of which have historically been associated with stable democracy. The eradication of poverty has thus been one of South Africa's top policy priorities since its democratization. This was prompted by the realisation that no political democracy can survive and flourish if the majority of its people remain in poverty, without land, without their basic needs being met and without tangible prospects for a better life. Attacking poverty and deprivation must be the first priority for any democratic government (Monshipouri, 1995).

Thus, in its attempt to redress the imbalances of the past and the inequitable distribution of resources; which have perpetuated the high levels of poverty in the past, the South African government came up with relevant initiatives to reduce poverty. These included initiatives such as - the building of low cost houses for the poor; so as to curb the high rate of homelessness; implemented land reform policies; created job opportunities for the previously disadvantaged; improved educational facilities to curb illiteracy; and social grants for children, orphans and the physically impaired. Also, the policies in South Africa were developed in cognisance with the socioeconomic conditions of the country (Lipset, 1993).

3.5 Ethnic or cultural cleavages as constrains on democratic peace

Sharp national, ethnic, cultural or religious difference –especially where they overlap with material inequalities between the groups, make both transition and consolidation difficult. The South African society has been divided by race and material inequalities for decades, which has made peace impossible. However, the effects of sharp ethnic or cultural cleavages were mitigated by the new carefully crafted constitution, which recognized the rights and privileges of all the South Africans regardless of their cultural background or political affiliation. Further more, inter-elite pacts keep the South African democracy going by binding or buying groups into the institutional structures of democracy. These countervailing conditions, enable South Africa to deal with divisions of this kind make it easy to maintain peace and sustain democracy.

If these ethnic or religious differences are not addressed, they can become the contours along which political mobilization flows, often with uncompromising and therefore anti-democratic consequences (Mainwaring, 1995).

Apartheid left behind a legacy of inequality. In the labour market and education sector, the disparity in the distribution of jobs, occupations, literacy, and income levels reveals the effects of discrimination against black people, women, and people with disabilities. These disparities were reinforced by social practices which perpetuated discrimination in education and employment against these disadvantaged groups, as well as by factors outside the labour market and education sector, such as lack of housing, medical care and transport. These disparities could not be remedied by simply eliminating discrimination. It was therefore necessary that, improved socio-economic policies, programs are designed and positive action taken to redress the imbalances of the past.

Thus, the transition from apartheid to post-apartheid South Africa was guided by the Reconstruction and Development Program (RDP), which had as its goal the mobilization of the people and the country's resource towards the final eradication of apartheid and the building of a democratic, non-racial and non-sexist future. The RDP policy framework was designed to promote integrated development, social transformation, and the means by which the process of change can be effectively managed. It focused on reconstruction on the roles government at all levels should play in realising its goals. The RDP became a vehicle to ensure equitable development of life opportunities for all the South African citizens, and its objectives included among others, to promote peace

and security; nation building; meeting the basic needs and building the infrastructure; building the economy; and developing human resource (White paper on reconstruction and development, 1994).

The Reconstruction and development programme was only the first in the series of transformation policies to follow. The government also decided to introduce the Employment Equity Bill to address some of these issues. The Bill seeks to eliminate the unfair discrimination in employment, and to provide for affirmative action to redress the imbalances of the past and to create equality in employment "employment equity". This legislation was drawn with the view of advancing those groups who have been disadvantaged as a result of discrimination caused by laws and social practices, and not with the view to seek retribution for the past injustices.

Blacks people women and people with disabilities today face a significant disadvantage in employment. These included occupational segregation, inequality in pay, lack of access to training and development opportunities, and high levels of unemployment. Black people, in particular, have suffered particular and pernicious disadvantages as a result of job reservation and lack of access to skills and education under apartheid. This discrimination sometimes takes the form of direct and conscious decisions, based on prejudice or stereotypes, to exclude certain groups from jobs and promotions. For instance, some employers, believing that women are not assertive enough to manage or supervise other employees, will not consider employing a woman in any senior position (Todaro, 1997).

Whilst the bill seeks to address inequalities within the sphere of employment (inside the labour market) it should be noted that these inequalities are also reflected outside the labour market. Extra-labour market inequalities are extreme and they have a direct effect on the quality and nature of labour that is supplied to the labour market. Factors like disparities in ownership of productive assets, the unequal division of household labour and the geographic distribution of population groups under apartheid all contributed to the reinforcement of these inequalities.

Whereas South Africa is not a poor country by international standards, it is infamous for having the most unequal distribution of income in the world. In its 1996 country review, the International Labour Organisation (ILO) concluded that South Africa had the highest levels of inequality of any country in the world for which the ILO had data. The Labour Market Commission also notes that South Africa's skewed income distribution is reflected in the fact that the bottom 20% of income earners captures a mere 1,5% of national income. Further, poverty is overwhelmingly concentrated in the African and Coloured population: 95% of the poor are Africans, and 65% of Africans are poor. The Labour Market Commission notes that roughly 33% of the Coloured populations live in poverty compared to 2.5% Asians and 0.7% for Whites. This racial inequality is also reflected in the situation in respect to unemployment in the country. Using an expanded definition of unemployment, among Africans, unemployment stands at roughly 41%, among Coloureds it is 23%, whilst among Asians 17% but only 6,4% amongst Whites (www.polity.org.za/html/govdocs/bills/1997/equity.html).

There is also a gender element to the inequality, with women having a higher unemployment rate than men. Occupational segregation is still a serious problem even within the new public service. Hence, the government saw it fit to implement Affirmative Action. The primary aim of Affirmative Action was to redress the imbalances created by apartheid. This does not mean that just as a white skin was a passport to privileges in the past, so a black skin should be the basis privileges in the future or does it mean that the government wants to do away with qualifications. The government is not against the upholding of standards as such but the sustaining of barriers to the attainment of standards. The special measures that the government has envisaged to overcome the legacy of past discrimination are not intended to ensure the advancement of unqualified persons, but to see to it that those who been denied access to qualifications in the past can become qualified now. And those who have been qualified all along but overlooked because of past discrimination, are at last given their due (Rowland, 1995).

Affirmative Action is rooted in the principles of justice and equality. Racial discrimination in education and access to employment, coupled with constant denial of opportunities to blacks and women, has led to the very poor overall skills levels to be found in the South African labour market. Inequalities lead to market distortion, which in turn resulted in the inadequate utilization of resources. It follows that the reduction of inequality in society is therefore a way of promoting economic growth. Employment discrimination and poor educational opportunities entail significant economic costs in terms of lower national output, labour market inefficiency, higher inflation, and excessive

welfare and penal system costs. The Bill recognises that the mere removal of discrimination will not lead to the advancement and development of groups that have previously denied such opportunities. Employment equity measures including affirmative action are needed to ensure that equality does not just remain a formality but is achieved in a substantive way (Monaheng, 1998).

Furthermore, the rejection of apartheid created many new opportunities, but jobs went unfilled due to lack of skilled workers. The legacy of apartheid created a dearth of employable people. Also, the requisite skills began to change, reflecting the new economy and its appetite for knowledge workers. South Africa's business was faced with a frustrating paradox: business taking off, but there were no workers to fill positions. Global access and competition was increasing, but business was losing talent to outside organizations. South Africa was as a result faced with the challenge of not only creating a workforce of the future, but also the workforce of today. It had to train and educate its current population while preparing its future workforce (Makgohloa, 1995).

South Africa rose to the challenge by enacting legislation and creating programs to train its workforce while building a national framework for life long learning. The process was set in motion by a combination of legislative acts; the Skills Development Act (1998), the National Qualifications Framework, operated as the building blocks in creating a new South African workforce. These acts became leveling instruments, designed to pave over previous inequalities by preventing and prohibiting unfair discrimination and

promoting equality. Skills development act was promulgated to increase investment in education and training, right historical wrongs regarding access and opportunities to learn, and encourage employers to use their workplace as active learning environments (www.findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_m4467/is_9_55/ai_78873714).

In addition, to help workers who have experience but little formal education, the Adult Basic education and training program was created. Abet enables semiliterate or illiterate workers to gain literacy. Once they have been empowered with reading abilities, workers can obtain a formally recognized qualification under the National Qualification fund and move up the career ladder (Rowlands, 1995).

The government's socio-economic policies coupled with its so-far-successful management of the political transition to majority rule have bolstered confidence in its ability to transform South Africa from a conflict-ridden apartheid society to a prosperous democratic success story.

CHAPTER FIVE

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Conclusion

It has been reflected in the study that conflict in South Africa was caused by the lack of confidence in the former apartheid government that represented the viewpoints of only a quarter of the South African society and distributed the resources unfairly. It used cultural and ethnic stereotypes as a tactic of maintaining authority. The study also showed that authoritative governments as was the case in South Africa tend to perpetuate inequality and unfairness in their governing processes that often lead to the outbreak of violence. Lacking legitimacy, authoritative governments all too often take recourse to intimidation and violence in order to suppress internal dissent. They tend to repress institutions such as a free press and an independent judiciary, which can provide transparency and accountability necessary to discourage such governmental manipulation of citizens.

The study has further reflected that it was through the democratisation process that South Africa managed to overcome the adversities caused by apartheid and became a peaceful and prosperous democratic country. South Africa's democratization process began with a negotiated power sharing agreement between the former government and the main opposition party the (ANC), that enabled South Africa to create a culture of democracy. That is, a political culture which is fundamentally nonviolent; whereby the state promote good governance by creating suitable conditions for conducting free and fair

elections; a culture where no one party or group experts to win or lose all the time; where there is consensus about the process, the framework and the rules of the democratic political life. Such a culture is built upon the belief that the will of the people is the basis of governmental authority; that all have the right to take part in government, that power should change hands through popular suffrage rather than intimidation or force; that political opposition and minorities have a right to express their views; and a system that accepts and acknowledges loyal opposition to the government in power.

The study has also reflected that, in order for democratization to succeed there is a need for the creation of a new constitution and policy changes. Former oppressive and unrepresentative policies need to be replaced by new all-inclusive policies that safeguard the rights of every individual regardless of their background. Reformatory bills or policies such as the Land Reform policies, Affirmative Action and Employment Equity Bills had to be passed to redress the imbalances created by the past regime. This was done in an attempt to balance or improve the socio-economic standards of the previously marginalized with those who have been privileged before. Democratization is also a conflict resolution and peace building exercise as it enables parties to resolve the conflicts that they would otherwise be fought on the battleground through the ballot box.

Conflict resolution and peace building are and should an integral part of the democratization process. Transitions to democracy go through a number of phases such as, transactional (negotiation, mediation); structural (capacity

building and civil society building, including media, rule of law institutions, human rights etc.); and transformational (confidence building, reconciliation and peace education). Conflict resolution is critical to each of these phases and at all levels of society. Specifically, conflict resolution projects, particularly those involving marginalized groups in society, such as women, youth, children and ethnic or religious minorities, contribute to sustaining a culture of democracy. Democracy in today's ever-changing world means pluralism; identity and geography are no longer synonymous and "majority rule" must give way to power sharing in societies with a multiplicity of ethnic, religious, racial, and socio-economic groups. Conflict resolution addresses the needs of pluralism; it can be a slow process, but it helps ensure equal rights, a fundamental principle of democracy.

Recommendations

A number of southern African countries such as Zimbabwe and Lesotho are currently experiencing leadership problems (problems on how to govern their communities); high levels of poverty; and continuous out break of violence. Thus, the recommendation for this factor is that Southern African countries should embark on democratization, rather the hosting period elections that are followed by continuous oppression and deprivation. Democratization here implies that, these countries should start on the negotiation table to reach an all-inclusive agreement on the processes of government and adhere to thos3e promises. They have to realize that democratization involves creating a legitimate government (a government that is accepted by all), establishing a

democratic constitution as the basis for rule of law, exercising policy restrains by the winning party, dealing away with cultural and ethnic cleavages, acceptance of opposition to the party in government.

Most of the Southern African countries tend to perceive hosting regular elections as being synonymous with democratization, hence another recommendation is that education on democratization and peace education should be included in their education (school) curriculum so that there can be more clarity on the subject.

As South Africa is one of the most promising Southern African countries on transition to democratization, other in the region can use it as an example and follow in its footsteps, but should be done bearing in mind that socio-economic conditions of each and every country differs, so it is important that each country determines the form, the timing, the pace and character of its democratization process.

References

Books

1. Annan, K. (1998) Foreword. In Harris P. & Reilly B. (eds) *Democracy and deep rooted conflict*: Options for negotiators. Stockholm: International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance.
2. Anstey, M. (1999) *Managing Change*: Negotiated conflict. Zebra Publications: Hout Bay.
3. Baker, H. P. (2003) Conflict resolution versus democratic government: Divergent Path to peace? *In Turbulent peace: The challenges of managing international conflict.* Edited by Crocker, A.C., Hampson, F.O. & Aall, P. United States University Press: Washington, D.C.
4. Bayart, J.F. (1998) *The state in Africa*: The politics of the belly. Longman Press: London.
5. Bekker, S & Carlton, D. (1996) *Racism, xenophobia and ethnic conflict.* Durban: Indicator Press.
6. Butler, A. (2001) *Democracy and apartheid*: Political theory, comparative politics and the modern South African state. Palgrave: New York.
7. Christie, K. (2002) *The South African Truth Commission.* Macmillan Press: Basingstoke.
8. Coleman, M. (ed) (1998) *A crime against humanity*: Analysing the repression of the apartheid state. Johannesburg: Human Rights Committee.
9. Crocker, C.A. (editor) (2003*) Turbulent Peace*: The challenges of managing International conflict. Unites States institute of Peace Press: Washington D.C.

10. De Bono, E. (1996) *Conflicts*: A better way to resolve them. London: Harrap Limited.

11. De Beer, F, & Swanepoel, H. (1998) *Community Development and beyond: issues, structures and procedures.* Pretoria: J.L. Van Schalk.

12. De villers, D. (1993) *Transition by transactions*: A theoretical and comparative analysis of negotiated transitions with special reference to South Africa, 1989-1992. Unpublished D Phil thesis, University of Port Elizabeth.

13. Galtung, J (2001) After violence, Reconstruction, reconciliation and Resolution in Abu-Nimur, M, *Reconciliation, Justice and Coexistence. London:* Lexington books.

14. Government of South Africa. (1994) *White paper on reconstruction and development.* Pretoria, September.

15. Harris, P & Reilly, B. (eds) (1998) *Democracy and deep-rooted conflict*: options for negotiators. Stockholm: International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance.

16. Held, D. (1996) *Models of democracy* (2nd edition) Polity Press

17. Hindess, B. (1995*) Discourse of Power: From Hobbes to Foucault.* Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

18. Horowitz, D.L. (1995) *A democratic South Africa*? Constitutional engineering in divided society. Oxford University Press: Cape Town.

19. Howarth, D.R. and Norval A.J. (editors) (1998) *South Africa in transition*: New theoretical perspective. St. Martin's Press, INC. United States of America.

20. Huntington, S. (1991) *The Third Wave*. University of Oklahoma Press: Norman OK.

21. Hyslop, J. (editor) (1999) *African democracy in the era of globalization.* Witwatersrand University Press: Johannesburg.

22. Jervis, R. (1999) Neorealism, Neoliberalism, and cooperation: Understanding the Debate" Journal of International Relations, Vol.25 (2).

23. Lambourne, W. (2001) Justice and Reconciliation, Post conflict peace building in Abu-Nimur, M. *Reconciliation, Justice and Coexistence.* London: Lexington books.

24. Lampen, J. (editor). (2000). *No Alternative? Nonviolent responses to repressive regimes.* New York: William SessionsLtd.

25. Leedy, P.D. (1997) *Practical Research Planning and Designs.* Sixth edition, Prentice Hall, INC. New Jersey, Columbus, Ohio.

26. Lederach, J.P. (1997) *Building Peace: Sustainable Reconciliation in Divided societies.* Washington DC: United States institute of peace press.

27. Leftwich, A. (ed) (1995) *Democracy and development*: Theory and Practice. Cambrige: Polity Press.

28. Lipset, J. (1993) " *A comparative analysis of the social requisites of democracy.* " International social science journal, Vol.136, pp.155-75.

29. Lodge, T. (1995) " *South Africa*: Democracy and development in a post-apartheid society" in Leftwich,a. (ed) pp.188-191).

30. Mainwaring, S. (1995) *Transitions to democracy and democratic consolidation*: Theoreical and comparative issues. Cambrige: Polity Press.

31. Mhone, G. & Edigheji, O. (2003) *Government in the New South Africa*: The challenges of globalization. University of Cape Town Press: Cape Town.

32. Miall, H. Ramsbotham and Woodhouse. (2001) *Contemporary Conflict Resolution, Post Settlement Peace Building.* Malden, MA: Blackwell.

33. Monaheng, T. (1998) Participation and human development: some implementation problems. *Africanus*, 28 (1).

34. Monshipouri, M. (1995) *Democratization, Liberalization and Human rights in the Third world.* Lynne publishers: Canada and USA.

35. Ojo, B.A. (Editor) (1999) *Contemporary African Politics*. A comparative Study of political transition to democratic legitimacy. University press of America: New York, Oxford.

36. Price, R.M. (1991) *The apartheid state in crisis*: Political transformation in South Africa, 1975-1990. New York: Oxford University Press.

37. Rothman, J. (1997) *Resolving Idèntity Based Conflict in Nations, Organizations and Communities*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

38. Rowland, J. (1995) Empowerment examined. *Development in practice,* 5(2).

39. Rummel, J. (1994) *Death by Government*. New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers.

40. Sparks, A. (1995) *Tomorrow is another country*: the inside story of South Africa' negotiated revolution. London: Heinemann.

41. Sorensen, G. (1993) Democracy and Democratization: Process and Prospects in a changing world. West view: Boulder.

42. Todaro, M.P. (1997) Economic development. 6th edition. London: Longman.

43. Tucker, B. ad Scott, B.R. (1996) *South Africa*: Prospects for successful transition. The Rustic press (Pty) Ltd. Cape Town

44. Wiseman, J.A. (editor) (1995) *Democracy and Political change in Sub-Saharan Africa.* Routledge: New York, United States of America.

Web sites

1. The long walk of Nelson Mandela: Viewers' and teachers' guide. (n.d) Available from: http://www.Pbs.org/wgbh/pages/frontline/shows/Mandela/teach.htm (04/06/2004)
2. Yergin, D. and Stanislaw, J. (1998) Development in Africa. Available From: http://www.pbs.org/wghb/commanding heights/shared/minitextlo/ess_africa_devel.htm (30/09/2004)
3. Ocitti, J. (1999) Media and Democracy in Africa: Mutual political bedfellows or implacable arch-foes. Available from: http://www.wcfia.harvard.edu/fellows/papers98-99/ocittoi.pdf (30/09/2004)
4. Africa watch overview (n.d) Available from: http://www.org.reports/1992/wr92/afw.htm (30/09/2004)
5. Hauss, C. (1998) http://www.intractableconflict.org/m/democratization.jsp Available from: (18/10/2004)
6. http://www.ppu.org.uk/learn/conflict/st_conflict1.html (09/12/2004)
7. http://projects.sipri.se/expcon/natexpcon/Safrica/formilass.htm (30/11/2004)