Rules of engagement

A debate of global relevance in today’s social, economic and political context

Chris Landsberg

To suggest, in the current highly charged political atmosphere, that South Africans should become serious about engagement, would be regarded by some as outright dangerous. But the causes of the current tensions within the ruling alliance, between the governing coalition and opposition parties, and between the coalition and many civil society organisations, are precisely the reasons why we have to become serious about engagement.

The government has, since the 2004 polls, repeatedly its commitment to transform South Africa into an “activist, transformative, developmental” state. It is important to appreciate that such a state is, by its very nature, engagist and participatory. Such a proactive developmental state is also serious about institutional reform, building strategic and managerial skills, and ensuring that the state and private sector, with development finance institutions, act in concert and move in the same direction to meet commonly agreed-upon goals.

In our case, it is a state in which key strategic actors agree, for example, on how to address the “first” and “second” economy divides. Above all, there is a state in which its core institutions and civil society, agree on the development and political trajectory society should move in. They will engage each other independently and critically, but confidently and on the basis of mutual responsibility and accountability.

In short, it is a state that affords us an historical opportunity to transcend the narrow “isms” debate — a false choice between “capitalism” versus “socialism”. A debate about state and engagement that affords an opportunity to articulate a unique, workable and legitimate ideology — one that will enjoy widespread credibility.

Not only does such a debate have relevance for South Africa, but all countries in Southern Africa. Examples from other Southern African countries may have a lot to teach South Africa.

So, what is engagement in a real and strategic sense? Engagement comes with rules of the game — rules of engagement, so to speak. Engagement means, first, that the government, capital and civil society, recognise the need for opportunities to interact; these should include co-operative, complementary and conflictual interactions.

Second, the political, economic and social space should be created and respected by all. Engagement must, thirdly, mean the existence of a conducive environment, where mechanisms, processes and procedures are defined. Fortunately, we boast a constitutional and legal, even political order, which recognises the creation and functioning of such instruments.

To date, however, many of our mechanisms — from the National Economic Development and Labour Council to local government structures, ward committees and Imbizos, have not functioned optimally. But they exist, and we should transform them into operative structures.

Fundamentally, as colleague Ebahim Fakir would say, engagement requires vigilance to safeguard the mass-based interests that democracies should protect. There is a need for involvement to be across the spectrum of diversity, from those who say “No!” through to those who want to engage. The naysayers can help the engaged stay relevant, while the engaged can help the naysayers be effective.

However, it is important, so early in our democratic culture, to recognise that this dissension may also be the highest form of patriotism.

Kumi Naidoo, Secretary General of Civicus: World Alliance for Citizen Participation

Effective engagement between the government, business and civil society has the ability to result in better delivery of social services. It is this that happens, there has to be more frankness about the power and resource imbalances of the different sectors that are engaging with each other. However, while engagement has the ability of enhancing delivery effectiveness and impact, much more political cultural change is needed for civil society’s input around issues of policy-making and governance transformations that are urgently needed from the local to the global levels.

Riaz Tayob, South Africa Coordinator, Southern and Eastern African Trade Information and Negotiations Institute (Seatini)

Decisions, particularly economic, are increasingly made opaque and engagement from civil society requires vigilance to safeguard the mass-based interests that democracies should protect. There is a need for involvement to be across the spectrum of diversity, from those who say “No!” through to those who want to engage. The naysayers can help the engaged stay relevant, while the engaged can help the naysayers be effective.

However, it is important, so early in our democratic culture, to recognise that this dissension may also be the highest form of patriotism.

What the experts say:

Changing the face of poverty,
with creativity and beads

Four years ago, Esther Kahl started making traditional dolls with off-cuts and recycled beads. Soon, a major toy chain store helped her with her through its innovative policy to source a portion of products from small producers. Esther gained a business development loan from an independent local development agency that channels government funds to communities, and with this took the business to a level where she has created 20 full-time jobs in her community.

The same creativity and cooperation by the different role-players in policy-making can drive down poverty on a much bigger scale across southern Africa.

Nominate innovators!

Contact Sydney Adams on +27 11 250 7300 or +27 82 900 0766 or go to www.southernafriTrust.org for more details.

The closing date for entries is Friday 25 August 2006.

We invite you to nominate individuals or organisations of civil society, business, and government in any southern African country who are doing things differently to develop effective poverty reduction policies. The winners will be honoured at a gala event in Johannesburg in October this year.
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