

It is all very fine to appeal to White South Africans to wake up to the basic needs and grievances of Black South Africans, but it is pointless to do so unless you tell them what those are. Admittedly it is not easy to do this if you are a soldier and are supposed to eschew politics, for the basic grievance of Black people is the policy of the present government, and their basic need is to change it. If White South Africans want to get their Black fellows to share in the defence of South Africa they will have to agree to work out a shared future with them, and change their political direction entirely. Is there any sign that they are ready to do it?

During March Chief Gatsha Buthelezi made a now-famous speech to a predominantly Black audience of 16,000 people at Soweto. In it he appealed to White South Africans to accept the idea of majority rule. He said that, for his part, he hoped "the operative majority in this country will be a multi-racial majority". The response of the Deputy Minister of Bantu Administration, Dr. Andries Treurnicht, to this statesmanlike appeal, was predictably depressing. Chief Buthelezi, he said, was **preaching revolution**. What is more, he went on, the Chief's statement would be opposed by all

White people "with all their power", and it would also be opposed by South Africa's Black people. Dr. Treurnicht's ignorance of the aspirations of Black people was one of the reasons his appointment to his Bantu Administration post was received with such dismay. Nor does he seem to have learnt anything since he took it up. For we have not the slightest doubt that, were a freely-constructed referendum to be held on the question of Black support for non-racial majority rule, Dr. Treurnicht would find that the Chief's support was quite overwhelming. And he would have White support, too.

If White South Africa were to accept the Buthelezi call, no doubt some people would have unhappy experiences and uncomfortable moments during the transition to majority rule, but think of the benefits. Overnight almost the entire African continent would change from enmity to friendship, the teeth of Communist subversion would be drawn, and the Brigadier could spend his nights quietly at home with his family, instead of stumping the country gathering recruits from draughty halls for what is, inevitably, a lost cause—the defence of a system of government with not a friend in the world worth having. □

2.

WHICH WAY

DO THEY GO FROM HERE ?

The South African Government must be reminded on every possible occasion that its representative at the United Nations pledged it, over a year ago, to move away from discrimination based on race—and that it has done precious little about it since then. Now it has been given a chance to show if it meant what it said. And it need do nothing, just not interfere.

The Roman Catholic Bishops' Conference has announced its intention to open its White private schools to all races, and the Anglicans and Methodists have come out in support. High time, one might say, for although there have been periodic attempts in recent years to admit Black students to White church schools, how it ever came about that past church authorities allowed these schools to develop on racial lines is something that no Christian will ever be able to explain adequately or justify at all. However, that is another point. The point of the moment is that the Minister of Bantu Administration's immediate—one might almost say, reflex—reaction to the Catholic Bishops' announcement

was to say sternly that the Government would not consider changing its policy with regard to apartheid in schools. Will he think again? Because, if he won't, the whole Nationalist claim to be moving away from discrimination will be shown to be the sham that many people already suspect it to be.

Although it was certainly coincidence, within a few days of the meeting of the Catholic Bishops' Conference a new Reservation of Separate Amenities Bill was announced, giving the Government sweeping powers to control the admission of individuals and organisations to certain amenities and places. First reaction to the Bill was that it was clearing the ground for a new clampdown on the activities of the few integrated sporting and other bodies which still exist. Now, the view of some people is that the Government is taking these new powers in order to make it possible to **remove** discrimination from particular places and certain areas of public and private activity, in a **controlled** manner, and without appearing to depart from official policy.

Our own opinion is that the Government is taking these vast powers so that it can jump either way, depending on which way the pressures are pushing it. For instance, it could allow the Aurora Cricket Club to stay integrated if it thought the effect on its own voters would be insignificant, but it could close the Natal Society Public Library if that seemed to be what the exigencies of the moment required. The Government will be looking in two directions at once; over one shoulder at the growing pressure of world and African opinion, and over the other at its own lunatic right-wing fringe, terrified that it might hive off and join the Herstigte National Party's racist band-wagon. If, indeed, the HNP has a band-wagon. It is true that in the latest contest between the Nationalist Party and the Herstigtes the Nationalist lost about 850 votes and the HNP gained about 400, but the Nationalist still polled about seven times as many as the Herstigtes. At this rate it will take the Herstigtes more years to win even one seat than South Africa has left to solve its problems peacefully.

So the Nationalist Party has much more to fear from being overtaken by events than it has to fear from being overtaken by the HNP. We hope it won't fly into a flurry of reactionary fervour because it lost a few votes at Alberton. The pressures from Africa and the World, to say nothing of the pressures from within Black South Africa are far more significant than anything that happened there.

If the Government feels that it must use such devious devices as the Separate Amenities Bill to start dismantling apartheid, then I suppose we must put up with that, and just hope that it really gets on with the job—and doesn't forget to include the Church schools in its dispensations. But we must say that, if this sort of under-the-counter dismantling of discrimination in selected fields is what the Separate Amenities Bill is all about, that, too, fills us with despair. For it is only when Nationalists are honestly confronted with their position in the world, and are told without equivocation of the changes they must make if they are to survive in it, that they will be ready to start making the adjustments which are the only insurance for that survival. □

CRITICAL AWARENESS

An extract from the Graduation Address given at the Federal Theological Seminary, Edendale,

by the Very Rev. Desmond Tutu, Dean of Johannesburg.

The story is told of a history professor who gave an assignment to his students. One of them, in making an assessment of the facts had the audacity to say, "I think so and so". His assignment, so the story goes, was returned with the comment, "Don't think - give me back my notes!" Now all of us true educationists would rightly squirm at the travesty of the real purpose of education but we know that the philosophy of education represented by the professor of our story is far too prevalent for comfort. In that philosophy, education is a reproductive process in which the professor, the sole custodian of knowledge holds forth in front of his class. He pours forth pearls of wisdom and his poor students sit gaping like little fledglings when they are being fed by the mother bird. The hapless student must absorb as best he can this body of facts woefully misnamed knowledge and at some appropriate moment, the exam, he will prove how well he has been educated by regurgitating the facts on the exam answer book. He must merely be able to perform

a tour de force of memory to reproduce what he has been taught. The emphasis of this style of education has been on **what** to think rather than **how** to think. This style of education is bound to produce unquestioning, uncritical, conforming and docile persons who are unlikely to upset the apple cart or to rock the boat. In short, they are unlikely to be creative at all. It is a style that is far too authoritarian and I am afraid that this is a pattern far too familiar in Africa. I may add that this criticism has been levelled more and more against the educational systems of the north Atlantic countries.

The basic teleology of education, in my view, is to help individuals to develop their potential to the fullest so that they can become more fully human persons who have grown into a personhood which is measured by nothing less than the full maturity of the personhood of Christ himself. And a person in the Christian understanding is this chiefly because made in the image of God he is made free for free-