

last ten years, all of them have a prior claim to a share in the booming South African economy and all that it should mean in terms of job opportunities, education for children, health facilities and old age pensions. They have worked productively for their country and they do not belong to the East, Europe, or independent Africa, any more than Van der Merwe does.

These are a few answers I got when I asked people in the fishermen's flats what they thought about the Proclamation:

"Why do you ask me about the South African Government's latest moves? It has nothing to do with me: I am not a citizen. I was only born here."

"I think it must have been wonderful to have lived here 100 years ago. My great grandfather lived in such an interesting time and was free to use his skill and better himself. Nobody was frightened and we all had the same legal rights."

"I really can't understand why they want to move us but I have heard it is because the Government is afraid of the Africans."

"You could call it a challenge. Our few families against the Government and the rest who don't care. We stand to lose our living and friends: they have nothing to lose or gain. They really want us all to be begging on our knees and to be like the lovable fool Gamat with his skolly children. We didn't care what they thought when they left us alone, but now we really know our place."

"We are better men than those who made this plan to move us and that is some comfort."

The Prime Minister has warned the world of the consequences of taking a man's home from him. How then can his Government implement an Act which is achieving the removal of thousands of South Africans from their homes? (Reprinted from the **South African Outlook**, October, 1967.)

AUTHORITY AND FREEDOM

by **ALAN PATON**

The 1967 Edgar Brookes lecture on **Academic Freedom**, delivered at the University of Natal, Pietermaritzburg

I would have preferred the title "Freedom and Authority" which has a swinging trochaic rhythm giving promise of music to come, but I did not use it because it would lay me open

to the charge that even in the title I put freedom before authority, so I chose the title "Authority and Freedom," and I don't like it so much because although it has an iambic rhythm, it does not swing, being ruthlessly cut off before it can make any music at all. I know what these deep psychologists would say (i) this man is an authoritarian, because he puts authority before freedom, or (ii) this man is a coward, and is obviously sucking up to the big chiefs or (iii) this man is a cheat, because he obviously means the opposite. The answer is none of these. The answer is that this man is an alphabetarian and puts his subjects into alphabetical order. The question as to why he chose on this particular occasion to be an alphabetarian is utterly fascinating, but it is not the subject of this lecture.

We have been talking of these things as though one might conceivably be preferred to the other. But that is not the case. They are not alternatives, they are not opposites, in fact they are both essential to something which is more fundamental, and that is life, not only personal life, but also life in community. And what is more, we can live fully only when these two are present together, not only in our personal lives, but in our social and community life also. If freedom destroys authority, then the result is chaos; and if authority destroys freedom, the result is slavery.

The Language of Slavery

It sometimes happens that in rebellion against authority, people assert the belief that there can be an absolute freedom, a freedom which knows no authority. Yet that is not the way we are made. It is striking that man, in order to express the highest states of freedom, uses the language of slavery. When we hear great music, we say that we are spellbound. When we hear a great speaker, we say the speaker held us, we may even add, in the hollow of his hand. A great actress enthral us, literally hold us in thrall. A book grips us. A song captivates us. I think it was the Americans who introduced to the English language the expression "I am sold," presumably into some kind of captivity. It is strange, is it not, that the common element in all these bondages, is the experience of being free? The music, the play, the book, may make us weep, may fill us with that indescribable mixture of pain and joy, but what makes us weep and dance and laugh is not just the music and the play and the book, it is because something rises in us to meet them, it is because we are being glad to be what we are,

we have been caught up into a kind of bondage which is perfect freedom.

I believe with all my heart that it is that kind of freedom that authority should make it possible for us to enjoy. It is that kind of freedom which parents should give to their children, schools to their pupils, and churches to their members, and Universities to their students, and finally States to their citizens. The framers of the American Declaration of Independence tried to capture this extraordinary idea in words, and held it to be a self-evident truth, "that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are Life, Liberty, and the pursuit of Happiness."

Free to Live

What were they trying to say? I think they were trying to say this—that man should be free to live the kind of life for which his nature and gifts equip him, that as a child he should be as happy as he might be, that as a child he should be protected from all cruelty and corruption and exploitation, that his home should be preserved in so far as the State can do so, that he should never go hungry, that he should never be separated from his father or his mother unless it is for his own protection, or because of their dereliction, that he should be educated so far as his environment permits, whether he is clever, dull, deaf, blind, crippled, that in his pursuit of truth and knowledge no impediment should be placed in his way, that when he grows up no opportunity for the exercise of his talents should be denied him, that he should be protected against gross loss caused through sickness, disablement, and also—I believe—against gross loss caused by criminal acts of others, that he should be free to worship or not worship as he wishes, that he should be free to speak and associate and publish so long as he breaks no law of the country, that no punishment or restriction should ever be imposed upon him except by a court of law, that in his declining years he should be preserved from hunger, squalor, neglect, and harassment, that finally his body should be buried decently, without the present inhuman provision that if he is buried free, no person may attend his burial except the representatives of authority.

I am not saying the State must make us happy; it cannot do that. But it can guarantee our liberties, and with that guarantee as our protection we can make of our lives what we can and will.

The history of this extraordinary dialogue between authority and freedom is the history of man himself. It can never cease until man ceases.

Loud and Clear

It can be heard loud and clear today in the United States of America, where some voices urge that the only way to rid the country of racial trouble is to create more opportunity, and others urge that the only way to do it is to return to segregation. Some voices urge that the only way to achieve world security is to crush Hanoi and the Viet Cong, and others urge that the way to return to sanity is to stop the bombing. And there is the strange phenomenon of the hippies and the flower children. Why do you think they are there? Are they there because they are mad, or are they there because the world is mad? Many of them have opted out of organised society altogether. Is this phenomenon merely grotesque, or is it telling us something important about our own world? I believe the latter to be true. They have opted out of a world where men—or too many men—believe that the use of force will solve problems of the utmost complexity. Twice within my lifetime, the continent of Europe, the home of Western Civilisation, erupted into war. Once in my lifetime a man equipped with absolute power attempted the extermination of an entire race. Do not think I am sneering at Western Civilisation, for I am not. I am concerned—as many of you here are also—to conserve all that is worth while in it. But I am utterly astonished by those white people who derive such satisfaction from sneering at the tribal conflicts in Africa when their own forefathers waged in this very century two tribal wars on a scale never before known in the history of man. (When I speak like this, some white people are unspeakably angered and call me a traitor to the white race. I am not a traitor to any race. What I try to be is to be loyal to the highest values of that civilisation into which I was born. And if some regard me with contempt, which of us is to be pitied? they or I?)

Responsibility

Whenever in our own country a person speaks in defence of freedom, he is always reminded—and sometimes sharply—that where there is freedom there must be responsibility. There can be no doubt of that, it is absolutely true. But it is equally true that authority also has its responsibilities. It was Acton who said

that the supreme duty of the State was to make it possible for man to lead the good life. It is the State that is or should be the guardian of justice. If I were the head of State, I would have one guiding principle, and that would be to make no law that would deprive any man, woman, or child, of those human rights which I enumerated above.

My State would safeguard jealously the rule of law. The rule of law means that the State is not the arbiter when a man is deemed to be deserving of punishment. The rule of law means that a person—such as one of your own students—cannot be punished because he holds certain ideas, only because he breaks certain laws. And it is to me a grievous thing that so many people today accept it as right and proper that a man should be punished—and drastically punished—because he holds certain ideas and cherishes certain principles. And it is to me even more grievous when University authorities adopt this view also, and attribute their troubles to outside agitators whose identity is never revealed.

My State would not only administer justice, it would be merciful also. I read to you famous lines that were not written by a starry-eyed idealist but by the greatest of all comprehenders of the human condition.

The quality of mercy is not strain'd,
It droppeth as the gentle rain from heaven,
Upon the place beneath; it is twice blessed.
It blesseth him that gives and him that takes:

'Tis mightiest in the mightiest; it becomes
The throned monarch better than his crown;

His sceptre shows the form of temporal power,

The attribute to awe and majesty,
Wherein doth sit the dread and fear of Kings;

But mercy is above this sceptred sway,
It is enthroned in the hearts of Kings,
It is attribute to God himself
And earthly power doth then show likest God's

When mercy seasons justice.

I wish that such mercy were shown more often in our country, and I think particularly of some who have been banished, and now want nothing more than to return to their homes and their people and die in peace.

Task of Authority

Must I still declare which I put first, Authority or Freedom? What I will say is that I believe

that the task of authority is to guarantee our freedoms. Authority is a means, and freedom an end, and they are therefore hardly to be compared. When Authority becomes an end, as it did in Hitler's Germany and Stalin's Russia, then freedom dies. One of Authority's weapons in preserving freedom is law-and-order. But when law-and-order becomes the end, then Freedom dies. Freedom is best preserved by distributing and balancing authority, but when Authority becomes monolithic, then freedom dies.

You at this University have a duty to remind us that man was not made to obey, he was made to be free, and he must learn that he cannot be free if he cannot also learn to obey. Authority is not God, it is the instrument made by man whereby he creates that law and order which will enable him to be free.

And the noblest kind of man is he who can both obey and be free.

And the noblest kind of country is the country that enables its people both to obey and to be free.

May our country be that kind of country, and may we, by our work, our devotion, our criticism, our pursuit of truth, help it to be that kind of country.

I salute you all, and wish for you that your lives may be purposeful, for it is when we have purpose that we are free.

A FRANCHISE SYSTEM FOR DIVIDED COMMUNITIES

by **KEN HILL**

(A suggestion in reply to the article by Prof. G. D. L. Schreiner in our last issue.)

The following system was devised primarily for South Africa with its present (1967) intense racial divisions and antagonisms. It is designed to achieve, as far as possible, the following not entirely compatible aims:—

- (a) Adult suffrage with absolutely equal voting powers for all voters, hence majority rule.
- (b) The maximum chances for party political divisions to develop over principles of government rather than over other group interests, hence no classification of voters by race, religion, status, wealth, etc.