

By a concrete model of a reconciled community I mean a social situation in which people are made to experience what it means to go through the process of reconciliation and also appreciate the fruits of fellowship. The present segregated structure of the church in South Africa has meant that the church has failed to be such a model of a reconciled community. The church has virtually become a microcosm of the racially balkanized society we find in South Africa. It is considered axiomatic by some people that the church should fashion itself after the image of society. Any form of deviation from the pattern of traditional apartheid in South African society is considered an act of undermining the security of the country. The church is no longer a salt to the world but is instead salted by the world. I say this in full awareness and appreciation of the growing concern in many churches for redeeming the situation.

It cannot be denied that groups like the Christian Institute have in the past devoted all their attention to the

problem of reconciliation as a basis for real and lasting security in South Africa. We should thank God for this.

In my opinion it is because many white people have not accepted reconciliation between the races in South Africa as the only basis of the future security that they call in question the christian integrity of those who have tried to create models of reconciliation. Yet there is an urgent need for such models. It is to the credit of bodies like the Christian Institute that concerned christians have been given the opportunity of witnessing to reconciliation as an alternative basis for security in South Africa. The credit also goes to those churches and christian groups which have given the Christian Institute moral and material support in its contribution towards the search for security in this country.

Against the background of all these facts I recommend that we thank God for one of his gifts to South Africa, the Christian Institute. □

DON'T PLAY WITH APARTHEID — ISOLATE IT

by Roger Roman

1970 saw the cancellation of the proposed tour of Britain by a 'whites only' Springbok cricket team. This was the result of what was perhaps the most successful protest campaign ever witnessed, namely the "Stop the Seventy Tour" (S.T.S.T.) campaign. Now a new action-group has been formed along the same lines, and with several of the same leaders. "Stop the Apartheid Rugby Tour" (S.A.R.T.), is going to be in the front lines of a battle to bring about the cancellation of the proposed British Lions rugby tour of South Africa, next year. This article will give some of the background information needed to assess S.A.R.T., and to understand its motives.

The whole sports system is controlled by whites, for the enjoyment of whites, and to the practical exclusion of all others. Racial discrimination rules every facet of it at all levels, and in all its forms. White South Africans have more leisure, economic resources and opportunities to play sport; whereas the blacks have to contend with apartheid as well as having less leisure, economic resources, and opportunities.

The greatest discrimination lies in the facilities available to the whites and blacks; It starts at grass-root level with the virtual absence of public parks and play-grounds in black areas, severely retarding the growth of sporting in-

terests and skills in the black youth. A statement by the Director of Housing and Coloured Affairs for Port Elizabeth was made in 1969: "There are 4,000 registered adult members of Coloured rugby and soccer associations in Port Elizabeth. This means that there are 364 individual teams for which we need 61 fields for weekend league fixtures. We have 13 fields available. "This illustrates the position at club level. Where in South Africa do we find such a lack of facilities for whites? At first class level we find no Ellis Parks, Kings Parks, or Loftus Versvelds for the black athlete. Thus even if he has the opportunity to play sport regularly the black man is severely handicapped by lack of facilities.

Racial discrimination means that the Government decides who can play whom, not the sportsmen themselves. It means that the spectators at matches are fenced off from one another into racial groups. It means that there is a complete lack of reports of black sporting events, in the sports pages of white newspapers. It means that the different races cannot share the enjoyment of sport together in the way they want to. It means that the black sportsman is also denied the right officially to represent his country overseas.

Small wonder, then, that the Basil D'Olivieras, the Precious McKenzies, the Steve Makones and the Albert Johannesons, to name but a few, have had to leave their

homes in South Africa in order to obtain sporting honours. In the long run it has been South Africa who has been the loser. She has lost unofficial ambassadors who would bring credit to any country in the world, and this is something she can ill afford to do.

This resumé gives us some idea of how the whole sporting life of South Africa is riddled with apartheid. Perhaps the worst aspect of it all is that the blame for the racialism must fall fairly and squarely on the shoulders of the white sports bodies, with very few exceptions. As the Minister for Sport, Dr Piet Koornhof, said recently when referring to the Aurora Cricket Club "... that whereas the law does not provide for a ban on multi-racial sports events on private property, the Government would not permit its policy to be circumvented at club level". From this it becomes apparent that White sportsmen have, in fact, imposed and enforced racial discrimination in their own organisations though no law forced them to do so. Whilst proclaiming themselves to be against racialism they themselves have been practising it by not doing what they could to prevent it. This two-faced attitude is a sad reflection on our white sportsmen. The usual bleat heard from the sports bodies is "the Government makes the laws, not us, so can we be held responsible for the present system?" They certainly can, and indeed must, be held responsible for not doing what they quite legally could have done to help their fellow black sportsmen. The pitifully few whites who have gone into black townships to coach or to arrange non-racial events, must be commended for their actions in the sports world. They have revealed the ugly hypocrisy of the other white sport bodies.

Racial discrimination became more entrenched with the Nationalists' rise to power, and resistance began immediately. Initially it came mostly from black organisations who extended invitations to the whites to join them, and applied for international recognition. They were almost totally unsuccessful in both of these fields. In 1958 the first step towards a more united front took place with the formation of the South African Sports Association (S.A.S.A.). Prominent in this body's lobbying, petitioning and appeals were Dennis Brutus (later banned and now helping S.A.R.T. in Britain), and Alan Paton. S.A.S.A. worked for the recognition of black sporting organisations, and for the participation of blacks in international events. After several fruitless years they came to the conclusion that they must work for the isolation of the white bodies in order to force them to change. 1962 saw the formation of the South African non-Racial Olympic Committee (S.A.N.-R.O.C.) to concentrate on the Olympic scene. S.A.N.-R.O.C. was forced into oblivion by bannings, arrests and intimidation by the Security Police. It re-formed in London and was instrumental in causing the Seventy Tour to be stopped.

The next few years were characterized by a growing opposition to racialism in sport, with South Africa being banned from competing in events in almost every branch of sport. She was not allowed to compete in the 1968 Mexico Olympics, and was expelled from the whole Olympic movement in 1970. In other words South Africa began to be isolated from event after event.

This was very painful for our white sporting bodies, and they at last began to confront the government. When isolation began to hurt them, then, and only then, were they prepared to make some changes. It is thus evident that change has to be forced on them from outside South Africa, and this must continue for as long as the present system remains unchanged. It must be borne in mind that it is the aim of groups such as S.A.R.T. to create a climate more conducive to change. They cannot change the policy, but they can change the minds of those who practise racial discrimination in South African sport. The change in any organisation must come from within, as the only other alternative is complete isolation.

It is on the above facts that S.A.R.T. is to wage its campaign for non-racial sport, along the lines of isolation for South Africa. We now come to the somewhat thorny issue of what methods S.A.R.T. will use. S.A.R.T. is modelled on the lines of S.T.S.T., and so the question of 'direct-action protesting' must be considered. I feel that S.A.R.T. must stay within the law in its campaign. There are two reasons for this. Firstly the infringement of the civil rights of others can never be condoned. The S.T.S.T. argument against this was that the need for action against Apartheid necessitates and justifies the use of militancy. Whilst agreeing on the need for action, I cannot agree with disruptive protests as a means of action. Democracy is a tool that S.A.R.T. can use, but it must not be abused as it was in Britain during the Springbok rugby tour. S.A.R.T. must stick to the principles of democracy, as failure to do this can eventually lead to the destruction of these principles. The second reason for sticking to the law will mean that those who are being attacked will not be able to avoid the main issue of racialism in sport, by launching a counter attack on the methods of the demonstrators. They will be forced to answer the attacks on the principles, and not the methods, if they can; and the campaign will have far greater effect.

S.A.R.T. is going to be calling for support in the months ahead, and it is to be hoped that white South Africa shows it has a conscience and gives the movement its support. The vast majority of South Africans will be thrilled if another tour is cancelled, as it brings closer their hopes of eventually seeing black and white together on the sports fields of this land. □

EDITORIAL BOARD:

Chairman: Mr. A. Paton

Board: Prof. E.H. Brookes, Mrs. A. Cobden, Mr. J. Corrigan,
Mrs. M. Corrigan, Mrs. M. Dyer, Prof. C.O. Gardner,
Mr. D. Hemson, Mr. K. Laue, Miss S.J. Lundie,
Mr. L. Marquard, Mr. M. Murphy, Miss F. Robbins, Mr. P. Stopforth,
Mr. J. Unterhalter.

SUBSCRIPTIONS: R1,50 (£1; \$3) for 6 issues.

Send to:-
Reality
P.O. Box 1104,
Pietermaritzburg,
South Africa