

those who make violent attacks on law and order and that S.A. needs arms because of the communist threat and to deal with terrorists. But this position depends upon one's understanding of law and order and the conditions we create which make South Africa a fertile soil for communism!

- When Fr. Trabard was recently deported from Rhodesia, Bishop Lamont of Umtali is reported to have said that the real terrorists in Rhodesia were the framers of the constitution. Can he be right? Is a terrorist only one who takes up arms to forcefully overthrow a government or can a terrorist, in the words of the Bishop, be one who forcefully maintains law and order? We have already pointed out in July that law and order can be, and sometimes is, a form of institutionalised violence.

If the churches are so strongly opposed to terrorism on our borders (and quite rightly so) are they equally opposed to violence in our country? If they are, what will they do about it (and not just say about it)? If they consider withdrawing from the W.C.C., will they follow the logical step and consider withdrawing from society here? Will they opt out of 'law and order' here?

It seems that to be involved in the one, requires the same involvement in the other.

- The churchmen have assumed that the W.C.C. money will be used by the liberation movements for military purposes. Some of the liberation movements support schools, hospitals, crèches and the like. If the money is used for these purposes, as the W.C.C. believes it will, will our churchmen still be opposed? If they are, will they follow the logical step, on the same argumentation as above, and close their schools, hospitals and crèches here? And what then are the churches' attitudes to U.D.I. Rhodesia? And what is their attitude then to South African and overseas trade with that government?
- No, there are too many ambiguities. We have raised only a few to show the complexity of the matter. Rather than oversimplify such a complex area, we wish rather to search for the truth. We must carefully examine, under God, what is happening and why it is happening. To this end we have placed a first exploratory response in this issue in order to raise some of the many questions involved. We hope to continue this exploration in subsequent issues.

M.C.

IN SEARCH OF A NEW SOUTH AFRICA

Richard Turner

All ideologies are based on a human model. Human models are rooted in understandings of human nature.

Richard Turner, examines various human models which underline some political systems in order to explore the dimensions of modern radical thought. He finds them closely allied to those of the Christian ethic.

Dr. Turner lectures in the department of political science at the University of Natal.

Contemporary radical thought questions not only the structure of modern societies, but also the value systems of the individuals in these societies. For example, the difference between the Black Power movements and previous civil rights in the United States does not only lie in a change of method. A change of goals is also involved. The desire is no longer to be accepted into white middle-class society, but rather to build a new kind of society with a different value-system and a different culture, and, in particular, there is a rejection of the whites' assumption that they have the right to select the criteria of 'acceptability', 'responsibility', 'civilisation' or even beauty. It seems to me that this characteristic of contemporary radical thought is significant for those who advocate a liberal-democratic policy in South Africa both because it embodies a valid critique of democratic-capitalist societies and because it is likely to coincide closely with the aspirations of significant sections of South

Africa's predominantly black population.

SOCIETY BASED ON A HUMAN MODEL

I shall briefly sketch the theoretical base for this critique:

The criticism is based on a particular analysis of the nature of human beings. Ethical concepts such as 'justice' and 'equality' refer to a desired type of relationship between individuals. This relationship is desired because of what it does to each individual in the relationship. That is, we believe that it is good for individuals to be treated justly and equally. Equality and justice are means towards the end of individual happiness. The significance of this is that the content which we give to such norms depends on the way in which we believe individuals achieve happiness, or fulfill themselves. I shall refer to a particular idea of fulfillment as a 'human model'. Equality as a norm does not require identical treatment for all individuals in all situations. It means that differences in treatment must be based on relevant differences in the nature or situation of the individuals concerned. In determining relevance, one factor which must be taken into account is this question of human models. The type of society one aims at depends on one's human model. If one sees human fulfillment in terms of a high level of consumption the sort of society one aims at will be very different from that which would be sought if one saw fulfillment as lying in achieving *sartori*, or loving God, or communicating with one's fellows, or developing one's intellect, or serving the glory of one's nation. Central to any ideology is a human model. It is crucial to realise this, for often in political arguments the disputants fail to realise that they are operating with different human models, and so that they are giving different meanings to key terms.

IDEOLOGY DEPENDS ON HUMAN MODEL

If one accepts that different ideologies depend on different human models, then the problem arises of what criteria one could possibly use in comparing various models. There are two possible approaches to this problem. The first is to say that an individual is fulfilled when his needs are satisfied, and so that it is necessary to find out what the needs of a human are in order to discover which model is correct. This approach, therefore, suggests that there is an objective, empirically determinable answer to the question. However, such an answer assumes that there are a fixed and constant set of drives and needs: a 'human nature'. Whether approaching the problem from an existentialist or from a marxist viewpoint, contemporary radical thinkers are unanimous in rejecting the concept 'human nature'.

It would require too large a detour to give their reasons for this with any rigour. Briefly, the fact of self-consciousness makes it possible for an individual to reflect on and reject his motives for any particular action. At the most elementary level, the statement 'man needs food' means 'if an individual wants to stay alive, he must have food'. The translation brings out the fact that the initial statement contains an implicit normative judgement, or an implicit choice-statement. Individuals can decide not to stay alive, and then they don't need food. Since nearly all people do in fact want to stay alive, the first statement is adequate for everyday use. In fact, in any given society most people do seem to want roughly the same sort of things, and it is this uniformity which leads people to think in terms of 'human nature' as an explanatory hypothesis. If we are to reject it, we must replace it with a better explanation.

BEHAVIOUR IS CULTURALLY DETERMINED

Once again, it is not possible to formulate such an explanation

behave in terms of their culture and that a culture is largely a social product which is imposed on each individual by the socialising process to which he is subjected in his particular society. He is 'taught' a set of needs, and he acts in terms of these needs. This raises a number of problems; two of which are particularly relevant.

CHRISTIAN MODEL BASED ON OPENNESS, FREEDOM, LOVE

1. Once it is realised that a particular set of needs is merely the particular human model characteristic of that culture, one is faced with a value decision. Should one continue to accept this particular model? What criteria could one use in deciding between it and other possible models? Fortunately I do not have to discuss this problem, since we are operating with a Christian model, which is based on concepts such as openness, freedom, rationality, and love.
2. Why is this particular set of needs imposed by this particular society? Structural functional analysis answers this question by pointing to the function which culture has in the overall social system. In order for the social structure to be maintained in existence, it is necessary for the individuals in the society to acquire the kind of behaviour pattern which is consistent with its continued existence, and the process of socialisation imposes this behaviour pattern. It has been pointed out by critics such as Easton and Buckley that the structural functional approach in terms of systems maintenance introduces a conservative bias by assuming that it is necessary for the society to maintain its present structure, and so legitimising the culture which enables it to

do so. Easton therefore introduces the concept of 'systems persistence'. The distinction between systems maintenance makes it possible to distinguish between, on the one hand, the necessary prerequisites for the continued existence of society as such, and, on the other hand, the much narrower set of necessary prerequisites for the continued existence of a given society with its given structure. One can then ask whether a given culture performs a 'maintenance' role or a 'persistence' role; whether it functions to maintain the given class, economic, and power structure, or whether it introduces the individual to an open-ended search for ways of living together with his fellows.

THE 'OLD LEFT' IS WORN OUT

The 'Old Left' criticised capitalism largely on the grounds that it leads to an unfair distribution of wealth and an inefficient use of productive resources. On the whole it accepted the capitalist human model of fulfillment through the consumption and possession of material goods. The 'New Left' agrees with the initial criticism, but argues, further, that the human model imposed in capitalist society is a function of the needs of the capitalist system, and that it involves the destruction of important human potentialities. Galbraith makes similar points, using a different 'language game', in 'The New Industrial State'. For example, he shows how the concept of 'consumer sovereignty' no longer applies, since ways have been devised of controlling aggregate demand through advertising techniques in order to satisfy the need of the industrial system for a stably expanding market.

He writes, 'But, as we have sufficiently seen, the system, if it accommodates to man's wishes, also and increasingly accommodates men to its needs, and it must,

This latter accommodation is no trivial exercise in salesmanship. It is deeply organic. High technology and heavy capital use cannot be subordinated to the ebb and flow of market demand. They require planning; it is the essence of planning that public behaviour be made predictable, that it be subject to control. And from this control flow further important consequences. It ensures that men and numerous women will work with undiminished effort however great their supply of goods. And it helps ensure that the society will measure its accomplishment by its annual increase in production.... The management to which we are subject is not onerous. It works not on the body but on the mind. It first wins acquiescence or belief; action is in response to this mental conditioning, and is thus devoid of any sense of compulsion. It is not that we are required to have a newly configured automobile or a novel reverse-action laxative; it is because we believe that we must have them. It is open to anyone who can resist belief to contract out of this control. But we are no less managed because we are not physically compelled. On the contrary, though this is poorly understood, physical compulsion would have a far lower order of efficiency.' (321-2). In a situation where productivity has reached a level at which rapidly increasing leisure possibilities open up, an ethic of consumption and need creation is imposed because the economy in its present form needs increasing demand, without there being any attempt to consider whether people need it.

ELEMENTS OF CAPITALIST MODEL

The capitalist human model includes the following three elements:

- (a) fulfillment through possession and consumption of material goods.
- (b) a tendency to compartmentalise life into a work sphere and a 'living' sphere, with

work being seen as an unfortunate necessity, rather than an area of possible fulfillment. (This is because the work situation in such a society is not designed to be an area of fulfillment. It is designed to increase productivity, which is not necessarily the same thing.)

- (c) the idea that exploitation is the natural relationship between people.

In a capitalist enterprise the employee is essentially a 'means of production', who may be oiled to make him work better, as other pieces of machinery are, but who becomes redundant if he plays no role in the profit-making process. Human relationships become instrumental, rather than areas for finding fulfillment.

ALTERNATIVES

Contemporary radicals suggest two other areas of possible human experience which, they argue, are more fulfilling:

- (a) the idea of work as a creative activity. This means that work satisfaction should be seen as one of the products of the production process, and should not play a secondary role to narrow criteria of economic efficiency.
- (b) the idea of community, love, cooperation with one's fellows as an end in itself.

These two may be united in the concept 'participation'...a human model of fulfillment through creative involvement in the social process.

NINETEENTH CENTURY PROBLEMS

I said earlier that the Old Left had concentrated to a great extent on material problems. The lesser emphasis placed on such problems in contemporary theory is of course at least in part the result of much greater affluence in advanced capitalist societies. In such circumstances it is natural to turn

to other unfortunate results of capitalism. But in South Africa our problems are perhaps closer to those of nineteenth century Europe than to those of contemporary Europe: an extremely inegalitarian society where large section of the population still live at or below subsistence level. Any reasonable human model will include as real needs adequate housing, food, clothing and health, so perhaps at the moment in South Africa issues beyond this are irrelevant. Let us therefore consider the problem of inequality in South Africa.

EXPLOIT YOUR NEIGHBOUR

There is certainly, in South Africa, considerable antagonism between the different 'race' groups. If we reject the thesis that this is due to some inherent incompatibility of the different 'races', we must inquire what the conflict is about. The history of South Africa since the beginning of white occupation is the story of the use by whites of political and military power to ensure first a near monopoly of land, and then a complete monopoly of skilled, highly-paid jobs. This means that today the large share of the wealth which accrues to the white section of the population is as much a result of their control of political power as it is of their actual contribution to production. It is this fact, I believe, that lies at the roots of conflict in South Africa. By this I do not wish to deny the reality of race-prejudice. Race-prejudice may be a way of rationalising one's right to exploit, or it may have other causes. The point is, however, that there is no reasonable basis in reality for race-prejudice, whereas black hostility to white economic exploitation is justified by the facts of the situation, and is not likely to end until white economic exploitation ends.

It seems, to say the least, unwise to assume that blacks will not use political power to end exploitation, since whites used it to install the exploitative system.

The whites are so entrenched in the economic structure that the only conceivable way in which this could be done would be through some form of socialism, that is, would involve a radical change in the white-dominated economic structure. Such a solution, by restoring some relationship between effort and reward, would also be a just solution. Any 'black' government is likely to be socialistic, and will be morally right in so being. The impulse which has lead most independent African countries to declare themselves socialist will be enormously strengthened here by the fact that, in a country with a developed and entrenched business elite there will not exist the possibility of a new black elite rapidly working themselves into a position of power in the private sector.

It is important to ask why the whites used their political power to exploit the other inhabitants of South Africa. After all, they could, 300 years ago, have started off by attempting to cooperate with the others to develop South Africa's resources for the good of all. The reason that they did not do so, I would suggest, is that the society from which they came was an essentially exploitative one, so that they saw exploitation as a natural relationship between men. In general, one cannot dismiss the surge of western imperialism which led to almost total global dominance, as being in some way accidental and extraneous to western culture. Western culture, as the lived norms of a society, as opposed to its written expression in Kant or Marx, Christ or Russell, is still exploitative; the norms of western society are the norms required by the capitalist system for its survival.

EXPLOITATION INHERENT TO NATURE?

This, I think, would be accepted by most people, but what one does about it depends on whether one sees the willingness to exploit as being part of human nature, or merely part of one human model.

If it is part of human nature, which I consider it is not, then it would seem unlikely that change will come about in South Africa without violence. A policy which tries to extend political rights to blacks in such a way that the rights will not be used by them to change their economic status (which, as I understand it, is the essence of Progressive Party policy) is not going to solve the basic conflict problem. On the other hand, if this is not part of human nature then it may be that some whites at least may be brought to accept another human model. It might be possible to show them that they too suffer under apartheid, that it deprives them of important areas of experience, that fear and cultural primitivism go together, and that it might be worth while exchanging a high level of consumption for community with one's fellows. That is, it might be possible to persuade them that loving one's neighbour is more fulfilling than the pursuit of wealth, which, incidentally, is the message of the 'western tradition', from Plato to Marx, and is also the central principle of Christian ethics and of contemporary radical thought.

IN SEARCH OF NEW LIFE-STYLES

Within the white group there are a number of people who may be brought to welcome the idea of the new society, rather than to accept it as a lesser evil. To get such people to accept the loss of a privileged material situation, it is necessary to show them a different human model. This involves making a radical critique of the culture, values and life-style of white society in South Africa. People who want to change South Africa must learn to live differently now. As far as whites are concerned, this does not simply mean being nice to their black servants. It means rejecting money-values and seeing ones political activity as the core of ones life, rather than a spare-time activity. Even a relatively small number of whites living this way

could play an important role in educating the electorate, who, on a personal level are reachable exclusively by whites, and could also help in other activities. Such a radical critique is also necessary to prevent middle-class blacks being caught in the trap of consumer society, thereby depriving the black population of a significant group of possible organisers. There is considerable scope for small-scale social-political organising among the black (African, Coloured, Indian etc.) population. It is likely that most of this work can be done only by blacks. In any event, one of the main purposes of such community organisation is to encourage local community leadership. However, whites might be able to play useful support roles in this kind of activity.

POWER VESTED IN ECONOMICS

Another important feature of contemporary radical thought is the attempt to work out political institutions for a socialist society. Both parliamentary democracy and the soviet model are rejected. It is argued that present forms of parliamentary democracy centralise political power and take it out of the effective control of the people. Five-yearly elections are not an adequate check on government. When the voter's only major involvement with government is to cast a vote once every five years he is effectively alienated from the real political process, and develops little understanding of the issues and of their relation to his everyday problems. The political party as mediator between individual and government tends to take on the characteristics of the system itself; the 'party machine' dominates the membership and the rank and file become increasingly divorced from the actual policy-making. The party tends to become an organisation for the achievement of political offices for certain individuals, rather than a cooperative effort to carry out a coherent program to attain certain specific ends. This effects political campaigning in such a way as

to reinforce the political isolation of the individual. The political arena becomes polarised between an atomised mass and a number of small groups trying to manipulate the mass in order to get political jobs. The result of this is to move the source of power in society out of the political arena and into the control of functional power groups, for the politicians have no real power-basis in popular support, as opposed to popular acceptance. In a capitalist society the major functional power-groups are the economic powers. In a socialist society the central planning body would be the major functional power centre. Parliamentary democracy of the type I have described would not be adequate to control it. There must be other centres of power which can be used by the people to exert their control over the central body.

WORKERS' CONTROL

The most frequently suggested solution to this problem is some kind of workers' control. The advantages of this would be, firstly, that the workers' control of their own factory or industry gives them a source of power and a natural organisation; and secondly that their involvement in the day-to-day running of the business would increase their awareness of economic and political problems, and of the relation between general policy and their own particular area of experience, and so would produce a much more responsible and aware electorate. Of course there are many detailed problems to be worked out before a working model of workers' control is arrived at. For the moment I merely wish to use it as an example in order to make the point that 'responsibility' is a function of degree of integration into the society's decision-making processes, and so that it is necessary to work out more effective ways of achieving this integration than have yet been put into practice.

Along with the rejection of parliamentary democracy as a solution goes a greater willingness to use extra-legal and extra-parliamentary

methods in the attempt to bring about change. Violence is only one such method, and has been advocated or used by a relatively small number of radicals in Europe or the United States. It has been realised that power cannot be divorced from organisation, and that organisation (as distinct from an organisation) can only be meaningful and lasting when it is related to specific and immediate problems. For example, in the United States black leaders have been organising tenants associations to take direct action against slum landlords. The importance of such organisation is that through it individuals learn to cooperate, learn that cooperation gives them power to achieve changes in their environment, and learn, through the attempt to deal with problems, the relation between their immediate problems and the wider political and social structure. In the present situation in South Africa this type of organisation is perhaps the only avenue left for fruitful political activity, on the part of both whites and blacks.

LOVE YOUR NEIGHBOUR

To conclude, I would suggest that contemporary radical thought is particularly relevant to South Africa in the following aspects

- (a) The rejection of the materialistic human model characteristic of capitalism in favour of a more open model which is much closer to the Christian ideal.
- (b) The attempt to rethink the political problems of socialism and to go beyond the Soviet model towards a participatory society.
- (c) The realisation that to limit one's actions to the institutionalised political arena is self-defeating. Political activity must be accompanied by change-oriented activity in all sectors of society, in particular in the cultural sphere, and around people's daily work and living problems.

In my previous article I discussed the responsibility - or lack of it - of the "Afrikaans" churches in South Africa for the parlous state of our society and alleged that a major share of the guilt must be attributed to them. This does not, however, completely exonerate the so-called "English" churches. They, too, must accept their fair share of the blame for the situation in which South African society finds itself. In this, the third article in this series, I propose to deal with this rather contentious subject.

By and large, the term "English churches" has, it would seem, come to mean what this term conjures up in the politically and ecclesiastically dominant Afrikaans mind, i.e. all strictly non-Afrikaans churches, but most specifically the Anglican Church, and, most terrifyingly, the Roman Catholic Church - the dreaded "Roomse Gevaar" - with the various Lutheran churches occupying a place somewhere on the fringes of the South African denominational spectrum.

LEFT IN THE LURCH BY THE CHURCH

The third in a series of articles on the Church in South Africa.

Cheap and facile generalisation is, of course, always a major danger in, dealing with something of this nature. Who, after all, are the "English" churches? By no means even as uniform a concept as the "Afrikaans" churches, who in themselves constitute no composite body such as the "D.R.C." (Dutch Reformed Church) to which English speakers are wont so glibly to refer.

When one speaks of the "English" churches, one may, in fact, only be making a linguistic distinction and refer to churches whose membership are essentially English-speaking - which would certainly exclude the German-speaking Lutheran Church in South Africa.

Conversely, one may be making a confessional distinction, derived from the fact that all the major "Afrikaans" churches confessionally adhere to the Reformed, i.e. Calvinist faith. This would again exclude the Lutherans, putting them into the "English" camp, but also causes grave complications as regards the Presbyterian Church (confessionally most intimately related to the "D.R.C."), the Congregational Church (which has just become more closely related to the churches of Reformed faith through the merger between the World Alliance of Reformed Churches and the International Congregational Council at Nairobi) and the Baptist Union which, politically speaking, in any case, stands far closer to the Afrikaans churches in their overt and covert support of the Nationalist government and its racial policy of separate development than does, for instance, the Presbyterian Church.

Another way in which basic disparities can be highlighted, of course, is to point to the distinction between the outspokenly evangelically-minded churches (sometimes verging on sheer pietism) and the more ecumenically-inclined churches. This distinction, for which there is factually a great measure of justification, cuts across so many other distinctions, however, that it complicates rather than solves the problem.

The "English churches", therefore, form a rather amorphous entity. But this amorphousness does not render them either anonymous or entirely guiltless.

They display, on the whole, certain common characteristics which are indicative of an ecclesiastical malaise peculiar to the non-Afrikaans-speaking sections of the Body of Christ in South Africa.

CLERGY/LAITY GAP

What almost universally strikes one about them, *in the first place, is that the English-speaking clergy, by and large, are almost vociferously outspoken in their criticism and condemnation of the government's apartheid policy; whilst their laity, though apparently assenting, quietly carry on running with the mainstream of political and social opinion in South Africa, except, as is now beginning to happen, when political and social events start touching their pockets economically. This certainly smacks of hypocrisy. One cannot cheer, sometimes even egg on, one's parish minister in his bold stand against immoral and un-Christian government practices and yet quietly (usually profitably?) carry on with the "South African way of life" and actively strive to maintain an ultimately untenable status quo. One cannot, on the one hand, shout: "Jolly well spoken, old chap!" and, on the other, bring financial and other pressures to bear on one's minister of religion on account of his disconcerting outspokenness. Too many "English" churchmen have I met who have been reduced to silence, acquiescence and impotence essentially because of the non-support of the members of their fold.*

This "English" ambivalence in approach and attitude also finds itself reflected in the very life of the Church itself. Ostensibly and sometimes almost provocatively most of the "English" churches welcome non-white members on an equal basis. But the instances of discriminatory practice in the running of English church schools have become