

in this issue . . .

	Page
EDITORIALS: 1. IS APARTHEID DYING	2
2. GET MOVING	3
THE EMPEROR'S CLOTHES by Julian Riekert	4
MORATORIUM by Pat Tucker	7
SOUTH AFRICAN LOVE SONG by Vortex	8
BANNING by David van Vuuren	9
DIAKONIA STATEMENT	11
THE FRAGMENTATION OF ZULULAND by T. R. H. Davenport	12
THE BORDER WAR by Keyan G. Tomaselli	16
DIALOGUE by Vortex	17
MANTIS POETS (BUTLER and CULLINAN) Selected Marie Dyer	18
REFERENCES	20
COVER DESIGN: THE YEAR OF THE CHILD: Removals by Joe Alfors	

Articles printed in Reality do not necessarily reflect the opinion of the Editorial Board.

EDITORIALS

1. IS APARTHEID DYING?

When Dr Piet Koornhof told an American audience in June, "Apartheid as you know it in the United States of America is dying in South Africa", there was consternation at home. Reactionary Nationalists, headed by Dr Andries Treurnicht, said that if Dr Koornhof had been correctly reported, he would have some explaining to do. Mr P. W. Botha played for time, saying he must first see the text of the speech. Having done so he came out in support of Dr Koornhof. All this is good. Confusion in the top Nationalist ranks is infinitely preferable to the monolithic certainties of Dr Verwoerd's day.

And of course some of Dr Koornhof's actions since he took over his newly-named post as Minister of Co-operation and Development would have made Dr Verwoerd very unhappy. His intervention to stop the demolition of Crossroads at the last moment is a case in point. The fact that he was prepared to sit down and talk to the Crossroads leaders was something quite unheard of. Previous Ministers in his portfolio had just managed to bring themselves to the point where they would talk to homeland and urban council leaders (although they didn't often seem to listen to what they said), but talking to urban leaders not

operating within the organs of apartheid wasn't to be thought of. Well that **has** changed, as further evidenced by the names of some of the people Dr Koornhof later invited to serve on the local committees he has set up to discuss the situation of urban blacks — Dr Motlana of Soweto's Committee of 10, Dominee Buti and Bishop Tutu of the Council of Churches, newspaper editors Percy Qoboza and Obed Kunene, and Professor Sibusiso Nyembezi represent anything but a list of stooges. Then there is Dr Koornhof's publicly expressed hatred of the "dompas", the pass-system. And finally his last-minute decision to put a moratorium on the application of the new influx control regulations which will impose a fine of up to R500 on any employer who gives a job to an unregistered black person. All these are important departures from past practice and very welcome. We must be forgiven though if after more than 30 years of experience of apartheid we approach these new manifestations of ministerial flexibility with some important questions in our minds. Dr Koornhof told his American audience "Apartheid as you know it is dying in South Africa." What we have to find out about this statement is where the emphasis lies. Is it **apartheid** that is dying, or is it apartheid **as we know it** that is dying?

The difference, of course, is crucial, and there are signs that it may only be the latter.

Of the people we have listed above who were invited to be on Dr Koornhof's committees Dr Motlana, Bishop Tutu, Mr Qoboza and Mr Kunene declined to do so. They no doubt felt that if they did they would be seen to be working within an apartheid framework, and lose credibility, particularly with the young black urban constituency to which they have access. Ds Buti and Professor Nyembezi agreed to serve, but within weeks both had resigned. It seemed that their experience confirmed what the others had feared, that they were not being invited to talk about getting rid of apartheid but only about how to make it look and feel better.

As far as Crossroads is concerned there are real fears amongst community leaders that the security of the people who can establish the right to live in the new township to replace Crossroads may have been bought at the cost of the removal to the homelands of everyone who cannot establish such a right. And it has also been said that the price Dr Koornhof had to pay to his verkrampte colleagues for his Crossroads concessions was acceptance of the R500 fine on future employers of illegal black workers, this being seen by good cynics as a far more effective means of controlling the entry of new black workers into urban areas than the old system where the penalty was borne by the worker. And, of course, many frustrations and heartbreaks and anomalies have appeared in the operation of the moratorium on the implementation of this new regulation.

The optimistic view of Dr Koornhof's efforts is that he is not only having problems with his verkrampte colleagues in the Cabinet, but that he is also having difficulty in moving that vast new empire of generally verkrampte bureaucrats, which he inherited from the old Bantu Administration Department in the direction in which he wants it to go.

The pessimistic view looks at the growing population of the homelands, swollen daily by new evictions from "white" South Africa, people either without work or having to commute to it under conditions of acute strain and discomfort, and unable to improve those conditions because of their exclusion from trade union rights. These people are being moved by Dr Koornhof's Department.

The pessimistic view is that once the numbers of black people with Section 10 Urban Areas rights in 'white' South Africa have been reduced to manageable proportions, where they no longer seem to threaten white control, such people will indeed be given rights, perhaps even all the rights, while the vast and less fortunate majority are converted into homelands citizens, tolerated as contract workers in hostels, those superfluous appendages, their families out of sight somewhere else.

At that stage Nationalist propagandists might well argue that everyone in "white" South Africa enjoyed the same rights, discrimination had ended, and apartheid was dead. Those millions of contract workers and commuters and their dependants were foreigners, who must look to where they came from for political fulfilment. And from a distance the argument might sound convincing. But from our close quarters we would know that apartheid was neither dead nor dying, just dressed up in new (and unattractive) clothes.

Our experience of the Nationalists has taught us to be pessimists rather than optimists. Nevertheless, if we are to avoid the road to destruction, somebody has to break the apartheid cycle sometime. Has Dr Koornhof realised this? Bishop Tutu wrote to him at the time of his invitation to join Dr Koornhof's regional committee asking him, as a sign of good faith, to abolish the pass system completely, abolish Bantu Education, stop enforced removals and associate himself with the call for a new National Convention. A lot to ask a Nationalist Cabinet Minister to take at one swallow, but even if Dr Koornhof were to undertake these steps one at a time (he could stop all removals tomorrow) there would then be some hope that apartheid was indeed dying. □

2. GET MOVING!

There is consolation in the fact that negotiations over Namibia are continuing, but none in the deteriorating situation there.

Mr Dirk Mudge keeps saying that he can't wait much longer for independence. The Nationalist Party leader has been threatening to lead his white followers out of the territory and back to South Africa. A white terrorist organisation has emerged and has decided that a meeting as innocuous as that of the local freemasons is a fitting occasion for it to throw a bomb and kill a man.

Meanwhile from the "operational area", wherever that may be, the list of 'incidents' and deaths lengthens, and a picture seems to emerge of a slow slide towards a Rhodesian-type tragedy.

So, let the negotiators get a move on, before things get even further out of hand.

And let them, pray heaven, come up with a solution that the world can support. Anything else will be a disaster, if not immediately, sometime. □