

in power in the next ten years. There was some relationship between what they saw and what they wished to see."

"While more Africans saw and wished a black or Africanist Government in power — 44 and 46% respectively, a significant proportion saw and wished (20 and 31% respectively), a non-racial, multi-racial federal, socialist or communist Government in power."

"Three whites and one Indian saw a Buthelezi headed government; 3% of the Coloureds and Africans and 2% of the Indians saw a government headed by Mandela and as many Blacks saw one with Sobukwe at the head."

"More whites — 6%, than blacks — Africans 3%, Indians 2%, and Coloureds 1%, saw military rule in the next ten years."

"Generally thus, the majority of Africans opted for an African or Africanist government in the next ten years and saw such a government in power in that time. They were far less inclined to name the first head of a Black

South African government. Whites desired and saw a white government in power in the next ten years. Slightly more desired to see the Prog./Ref. in power (16%) than the Nats. (13%) but considerably more (36%) saw the Nats. in power than the Prog./Ref. (7%)."

"Indians and Coloureds by contrast, wished above all for a multi-racial or non-racial democracy, but were pessimistic about realizing it in the next decade."

"THE INFLUENCE OF EDUCATION AND INCOME ON ATTITUDES

The study shows that there is no significant relation between education and attitudinal response, except in one respect. Eighty per cent of the Africans who rejected the use of violence in all circumstances had little or no formal education. Among non-Africans, the 'pacifists' were well educated." □

THESE ARE THE LAST DAYS

Extracts from an address delivered in Pietermaritzburg at a meeting of the South African Institute of Race Relations.

by Dr Manas Buthelezi

These two last years have made us witnesses of the great dramatic exercises marking the passing of the old order, and the pangs and agonies preceding the birth of the new. There is, however, no guarantee that we shall all live to see the dawn of the new day. Under the firm conviction that the South Africa that lies ahead of us cannot afford to be the same as the old, I am addressing you tonight on the theme "These are the Last Days".

I am saying to you these are the last days for old attitudes. Attempts to create better race relations have been made by many generations of South Africans since 1662 when South Africa for the first time became a multi-racial society. After the banning of the Christian Institute, the Institute of Race Relations is now about the only remaining organisation of its kind and stature. One may ask "Does this mark the beginning of failure to bring about change in South Africa on the level of race relations and attitudes?" Some articulate voices have questioned the wisdom of putting all the efforts into improving race relations on the ground that the deterioration of race relations is only a symptom of the basic problem which is the political setting that divides and polarizes racial groups. According to this point of view, the problem is not just that we should be nice to one another, but that we should remove what polarizes in the first place. Of course, having said this, we must admit that it is important to keep bridges standing. It is important lest people forget, that once upon a time it was possible for blacks and whites to be together without all these floods of laws. This reminds me of what somebody said last year. It was the Reformation Day, and many congregations, black and white, were together. Then somebody stood up, a white farmer, and said "We must really thank the Government that it is now possible for us to have this

kind of service". This shows how people can forget quickly.

In times of transition, while it is difficult to tell what is coming and going, what is passing or permanent, it is necessary to raise these questions. As a Minister of the Church, I am among the first to admit that it is a horrifying spectre to imagine life in South Africa without any form of organised contact between the various racial groups. Maybe some in our society, including politicians, do not have a full impression of what it would mean when groups in South Africa are strangers to one another, to a greater extent than now. How horrifying, how dreadful, and what kind of consequences this will entail.

The more I study the Christian faith, the more I am overwhelmed by its relevance and the far reaching possibilities in the application of its teachings to our contemporary life situation. These are the last days of the old racial attitudes that have come to characterise the South African way of life. What we see happening around us, even that aspect of it which is frightening, is nothing but the manifestation of the death throes of a way of thinking based on racial paternalism and feelings of racial superiority. It is true that those who have laboured most against these attitudes have had their wings clipped. I am persuaded to say that during these last days the occasion will arise when South Africa will openly and officially thank God for having demonstrated through Beyers Naude and those whites whom he represents, that South Africa is not without its built-in redemptive forces. The contribution of the Institute of Race Relations belongs to the same class of constructive effort.

Secondly, these are the last days to old structures. It is a

universally accepted principle that no system of government, regardless of the legal trappings it may have, can survive if it is not representative and does not capture the aspirations of the people whom it governs. No social, economic or political system devised in our country thus far, meets the demands of this basic principal. You know that what is not acceptable now, as apartheid, will be even more unacceptable in years to come. I do not need to get a certificate of being a Prophet to convince you that this is true. As we move on in our history, apartheid and separate development will become more and more distasteful. There is no evidence that the policy of separate development will all of a sudden become popular or ingratiating in the manner in which it is being carried out, and enforced upon black people. The present political structures are not adequate, as you know, as vehicles of goodwill between the various racial groups. It has often been said that there is a lot of goodwill among the people of South Africa, black and white, but I dare to say that what we lack are the structures for communicating this goodwill. You cannot have goodwill where people cannot meet together and express that goodwill, just as you cannot have love when two lovers cannot meet and be together.

The political structures in our country have a polarizing effect, that is why they are inadequate for transmitting whatever goodwill there is. Over the years, it has appeared as if it is impossible to implement the policy with any measure of humaneness. Mass removals of people, separation of husbands from wives under migrant labour, the hardships of bannings, and detentions, are just a few examples demonstrating that we are faced with a policy that can only be implemented in an unpleasant manner. Great empires of the past, like the Roman, the British and others, were able to last for a considerable length of time, because they had the capacity for absorbing and ingratiating their conquered subjects into the system of the conquering race. In the short term at least, they succeeded in creating an impression that it was possible for a loyal subject to share in common with the conqueror some of the cherished fundamental rights. That is why Paul was so proud of his Roman citizenship and referred to himself "As a Jew, a Tarsian from Silicia and a citizen of no mean city". When he was tortured under interrogation he invoked his Roman citizenship. He said "Can you legally flog a man who is a Roman citizen?" As you know from the Bible, this was not without effect, since we are told that the Commandant himself was alarmed when he realised that Paul was a Roman citizen, and that he had put him in irons.

You will remember that there was once upon a time "exempted 'natives'" under the British system. Of course, this was bad, but it does serve to illustrate that the old empires tried at least to create an impression that they were catering for the interest of their subjects.

But the present empire of separate development does not belong to that category. We are roughly twenty years away from the 21st Century. The whole world is moving towards the creating of democratic institutions. Even the worst of nations at least pays lip-service to democratic processes. I cannot think of any Western oriented country, apart from our own, which unashamedly cherishes and espouses a political theory which the rest of humanity finds to be patently undemocratic in spirit and letter. I cannot see how social, economic and political structures based on the theory of the separation of races which have had a common history can survive alongside the Christian principle of reconciliation according to which it is possible for even enemies to become friends. I cannot see how a country can claim to create lasting political structures for a future if, in so doing, Christian love and fellowship among the citizens is prevented from taking its course and moving people where they will. How can the Christian faith survive simultaneously with unChristian political structures? Apart from other considerations, this fact alone convinces me that any structuring of our

political and social life that is based on separating rather than reconciling those who feel estranged to each other, is doomed to fail.

The apartheid ship is bound to sink because it has very big holes, and anyone who wants to save his life should get out of the ship before it sinks. Let me demonstrate my point on the basis of the very Christian heritage South Africa claims for itself. From the Bible we are taught that when sin caused estrangement between God and man, God did not try to resolve the tension by means of separate development. In other words, God did not solve the problem by dividing the universe into his own and into that of sinful man. God did not see separate development as being in the interests of his survival as a holy God against sinful man who was out to dethrone him. These days we hear a lot about group survival. Everything is being said in the interests of saving a particular group, but how do you cater for group survival? Let us look at what God did when he tried to work in the interests of his own survival as a holy God vis a vis sinful man. He did not invent separate development. On the other hand, for his own survival as God, as well as for the survival of sinful man, God devised the plan of forgiveness and reconciliation in Christ. In other words, the solution was in coming together, in bringing together those who were estranged. It was in finding mutual interest that the very survival of the two parties was catered for. The solution was in bringing God and man even closer together. There must be something wrong in the notion of survival for any racial group in South Africa if that should necessarily lead to the imposition of separation and further alienation of all the racial groups in South Africa. It is for this reason that I am saying that the apartheid ship is bound to sink, since it runs contrary to what God himself did when he was faced with the same situation. For separate development is out of harmony with the method of resolving issues which God has taught us and shown us, in Jesus Christ.

Thirdly, these are the last days of the old generation. When I say that these are the last days of the old generation of South Africans, I am not necessarily thinking in terms of age in the sense of the number of years. In all historical epochs there are some who are born too late in the sense that in their thinking they belong to the past era, and also there are others who are born too early because they are far ahead of their time. With this I am trying to demonstrate that when I am saying that these are the last days of the old generation, I am not thinking in terms of years. It is natural that those who no longer have strength to adjust to a fast changing world, should use up whatever energy they still have in defending the past as well as its values. They feel an obligation to resist change because it will introduce them to a new set of circumstances to which they may be unable to adjust.

It is very regrettable that the concerns of white youth have not made a breakthrough in white politics. We have all heard people saying that University students, while they are still in the University are very progressive in their views, but as soon as they leave University they vote differently. It is for this reason that I am saying that they have failed to create an impact in white politics. In black politics young people are today a force to contend with. I believe that this is proper. Those who will lead in the future must have some say in the shaping of that future. In spite of their idealism, white youths have so far not succeeded in selecting and articulating issues which capture the imagination of the white community. Black youth, on the other hand, have been very successful in doing just this. Even though adults do not agree with all aspects of their strategy, they definitely support them in their objectives. Had this not been the case in Soweto and other places, the black youth would not have created the kind of political impact which they have. It is simply because they were shrewd enough to select issues which captured the imagination of their parents. One of the explanations for the current

political deadlock in South Africa, is that white politics is dominated by the values and ideals of the past in a situation where black youth, concerned about their future and destiny, have become a resourceful and innovative political group in South Africa. There is, thus, a wide communication gap between old white politicians who are jealous to nurse and protect the values of the past which seem threatened, and the black youth who are concerned about what the future has in store for them. Had the white youth been able to play a role similar to the one played by the black youth the present political situation would not be as frightening as it is. There is at the moment a conflict of interest. Those who are in power are not the group who will have power in the future. On the other hand, there are the black youth who are concerned about their future. There is a deadlock because there is no communication. We know that after the members of the older generation have left the political scene, it is present day young people, black and white who will have to live together. White youth may not be in power today, but it is a fact that they will live side by side with the youth of Soweto and other places. It is in their interest that they now create good neighbours for the future. A wise man always tries to cultivate good neighbours. We have been told and given advice to try and understand the thinking of white people. It has been said that whites are the minority – if you could place yourself in their boots, don't you realise that you would also have the same fears that white people have? And that is why, seeing that they are in power, they try as much as possible to claim power. My response to that type of reasoning is that if you belong to a minority, fear in itself will not solve your problem. It will only serve to complicate it. It will frustrate you and you cannot think clearly because you are afraid. Fear is a negative reaction in itself; it does not get you out of the ditch. You must follow a positive way. The positive way is for the minority group to make friends with the majority. If you cannot win them, join them. I do not know any other way except that.

If you begin to analyse the situation closely, you will discover that essentially it is not a question of a polarisation between white interests and black interests, even though there is an element of this, but basically it is a polarisation between a concern for perpetuating the past and a concern for shaping a new future. Unfortunately, those who are concerned with the past will not lead in the future, and

that is why they are reckless. They are insensitive towards the concern of those who will live in the future. It was ordained by God that the past will give place to the future at some point in the medium of the present. No matter how those who see themselves as guardians of past values feel disgusted about the new development of the future, they cannot stop the future from becoming the future. No one has power to prevent the whole generation of the future from articulating and realising its aspirations. Old people cannot force those of the younger generation to love and worship the past. All they can do is to make them respect it by showing them that it is an asset rather than an obstacle to the unfolding of the future. There is something wrong in a situation where concern for the values of the past is expressed in such a way that young people are prevented from organising themselves and giving expression to those qualities of leadership which shall be an asset for the future. It is definitely not in the interest of the country to prevent black young people from openly organising themselves and canvassing their ideas about the future they would like to have.

We all know that change in South Africa is inevitable. We cannot explain how it will take place, all we are sure of is that it will come about. All we are sure of is that there will come a time when justice will prevail over injustice, when liberation will prevail over bondage. We are certain of this because God created us all and God created this country. For that reason, it is important to have available contributions from the whole spectrum of the leadership resources in our country. No black leader can claim that he has qualities which are adequate for articulating all the black aspirations. For we heed them all. With all the bannings of black organisations and the detentions of articulate leaders, the black community has been severely immobilised. (At least for the moment.) Dialogue between black and white is impossible without a free flow of ideas from both sides, and without dialogue, racial fellowship is impossible. Where there is no fellowship, there is polarization, and where there is polarization, there is conflict. Is that what we want? It is important that we should not allow the inevitable calls of history to overtake us at a time when there is no dialogue and no meaningful communication between the various racial groups. We all have to make a contribution in bringing about desirable change rather than by being overtaken by history while resisting change. □

RATES (6 issues—published every two months)

ORDINARY SUBSCRIBERS	DONOR SUBSCRIBERS
S.A. R2,00 p.a.	S.A. R10,00 p.a.
U.K. £1,25 p.a.	U.K. £5,00 p.a.
U.S.A. \$3,00 p.a.	U.S.A. \$15,00 p.a.

EDITORIAL BOARD

Chairman: Peter Brown
 Vice-Chairman: Alan Paton
 Board: H. Bhengu, E. H. Brookes, M. Buthelezi, M. Corrigan, M. Dyer, C. Gardner, F. Laband, S. Lundie, S. Msimang, P. Rutsch, J. Unterhalter.

SUBSCRIPTIONS:

Send to: Reality, P.O. Box 1104, Pietermaritzburg 3200



Gloom over findings . . . expressions on the faces of people leaving the Old Synagogue, Pretoria, told their own tale after people heard the Biko inquest findings.

Photo: Peter Magubane