

in this issue . . .

EDITORIAL: FIGHTING FOR ONE'S COUNTRY	page 2
THE CASE AGAINST THE DEFENCE FURTHER AMENDMENT BILL	page 4
THE INSTITUTE VINDICATED? by Raymond Tucker	page 9
UPROOTING AND RESETTLING by Fatima Meer	page 11
"MULTISTAN" A NEW FACTOR by Edgar Brookes	page 16
THE CHALLENGES OF BLACK LIBERATION by Chief Gatsha Buthelezi	page 17
REFERENCES	page 20
COVER DESIGN by Jill Orpen and Don Paul	

EDITORIAL

FIGHTING FOR ONE'S COUNTRY

The South African Council of Churches (SACC) certainly started something with its resolutions on conscientious objection to military service. Archbishop Hurley added fuel to the fire saying that he could not counsel young South African men to fight for their country. All of this happened while Frelimo was taking over the government of Mozambique.

Responses were swift and varied. The Government announced that it would make it an offence to "recommend to, encourage aid, incite, instigate, suggest to or otherwise cause" any person to refuse to undergo military service. The maximum penalties on conviction would be a fine of R10 000 and 10 years' imprisonment. Some church leaders supported the SACC resolutions, and some acknowledged their validity while withholding approval. The church-appointed chaplains in the Defence Force repudiated the resolutions. A young debater

from Treverton School at Mooi River said in the Durban Parliament that a man who would not fight for his country was not worthy of citizenship. Letters poured into the Durban papers, some praising Hurley and some telling him to go and live somewhere else. The accusation was hurled at would-be conscientious objectors that they were really attempting to save their miserable skins at the expense of the lives of heroes.

REALITY has no intention of inciting any person not to undergo military service, but it intends to examine the meaning of the words "Fighting for one's Country." This is not a purely South African exercise. People all over the world—and especially young people—are examining the meaning of these words, which in certain circumstances and at certain times are the most emotion-charged words in the human vocabulary. What exactly do they mean?

At Pietermaritzburg on October 8th., the body of a young constable was buried with full honours. He had given his life on the borders. For the act of a young man who is willing to die for what he believes, one cannot but have the deepest respect. What we wish to examine are the words spoken by General Crous on this solemn occasion.

General Crous said that terrorists trying to infiltrate South Africa would encounter a united nation made up of different origins but with the common goal of preserving the country for future generations.

Is that true? Are we a united nation? What unites us? Is it the possession of a system of free, compulsory, and enlightened education that unites us? Is it a common sharing of power to decide our destinies that unites us? Is it a common pride in our institutions not excluding prisons, that unites us?

In any case, while General Crous has every right to use the word "Nation," his use of it is in complete disagreement with the dogmas of the Government and the Nationalist Party. The Prime Minister has explicitly repudiated the idea of a nation made up of different origins. He has insisted time after time that South Africa is a multi-national state. He has even rejected the idea that these nations could join in a federation. They are absolutely separate, and can co-exist only in a commonwealth that will have no common legislature. Therefore the Government, which after all controls the armed forces, cannot possibly agree with General Crous's use of the words "united nation".

What about the "common goal of preserving the country for future generations"? What does that mean, the actual physical country, or its institutions, its rigid colour bars, its bars against inter-marriage, its bars on mixed sport, its segregation of people "made up of different origins" in every possible place and at every possible time? Is that worth preserving for future generations?

What is a black soldier or a black policeman to fight for? Is it job reservation and the high cost of black education? And the young Indian sailors? Are they to fight for the Group Areas Act? And the coloured soldiers? For the destruction of District Six and the griefs of race classification?

These are nasty questions, but they have to be asked. And they have to be answered too, if General Crous's words are to have any meaning except on those solemn occasions when young soldiers and policemen are buried.

It was to be expected that the Nationalists would react with extreme anger to the SACC resolutions. The United and Progressive Parties reacted less violently, but with disapproval. Professor van Zyl Slabbert said in effect, of course one must fight for the country, because it is in that country that just changes are going to be brought about. He is in fact saying that we must fight so that we may gain that time which we need in order to do better. Chief Buthelezi, as might be expected, put it more toughly; he said in effect, of course we'll defend our country, if you give us a country to defend. It is indeed hard to die for 29 separate pieces of land.

We do not wish to pour scorn on Professor Slabbert's words, though there are many in this country who would do so. We too have urged, in season and out, white South Africans to do better, and the corollary of that is that we want time for them to do better. But such a decision commits us, and it commits Professor Slabbert and his party, to an unremitting, unrelenting, untiring, dedication to make this a more just society.

One thing is certain. Not one of us non-Nationalists wants to die for the Nationalist Party, nor for the Government, nor for the Group Areas Act and the destruction of District Six and that mean and miserable thing called Bantu Education. And there is little doubt that a very great number of Nationalists, when they talk of fighting for South Africa, mean fighting to maintain the burden of cruel and un-Christian laws that they have laid on our unwilling backs.

If the Government wants our support, then they must show us that the just re-ordering of society is **being done**.

At the moment we see very little sign of it.

A final word to the young debater from Treverton. You are reported to have said that a man who would not fight for his country is not worthy of citizenship. You are not reported to have discussed the question as to whether the citizenship is worth having. We hope that as you grow older you will devote your talents, not to glib generalisations on patriotism but to making our citizenship something worth fighting for. □

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

EDITORIAL BOARD:

Chairman: Mr A. Paton
Board: Mr H. J. Bhengu, Prof. E. H. Brookes, Dr M. Buthelezi,
Mrs M. Corrigan, Mrs M. Dyer, Prof. C. O. Gardner,
Mrs F. Laband, Miss S. J. Lundie, Mr S. Msimang,
Mr S. Nqayi, Mr P. Stopforth, Mr J. Unterhalter.

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

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