



Prime Minister

Foreign and Commonwealth Office

London SW1A 2AH

21 April 1986

With respect to the  
 Foreign Secretary, the speech  
 seems to me to depict  
 a ideal and academic extreme rather  
 than a practical one likely to  
 be followed by the South African Government.  
 If we hitch our wagon  
 to this star, we shall be

Reform in South Africa

The Foreign Secretary has read a copy of a speech recently  
 given to the South African Institute of Race Relations by  
 Dr Stuart Saunders, the Vice-Chancellor and Principal of the  
 University of Cape Town. He believes that the Prime Minister  
 may be interested to see this powerful plea for peaceful but  
 fundamental change in South Africa.

Dr Saunders is one of a small group of leading South  
 African academics whose views on political and social matters  
 attract attention inside South Africa. While it is impossible  
 to judge the influence they have, they do represent an  
 important internal force for change which the South African  
 Government cannot ignore.

Dr Saunders does not mince his words in analysing what is  
 wrong with South Africa. He argues that the fine principles of  
 President Botha's speeches must become reality; all  
 discriminatory laws must be repealed and the "confounded"  
 constitution introduced in 1983 must be replaced by a new model  
 not based on race. Failure to introduce necessary reforms,  
 coupled with excessive use of force by the police and army,  
 only play into the hands of the extreme revolutionaries.

Dr Saunders goes into some detail on the changes which  
 need to be made to the South African constitution. But, not  
 surprisingly perhaps, he stops short of offering specific  
 answers to the two most difficult questions: how do you abolish  
 all discrimination without being taken straight to one man one  
 vote in a unitary state; and how do you achieve equality of  
 treatment between the races without a massive redistribution of  
 resources away from the whites? Both questions, of course, need  
 to be answered in stages - the first perhaps more easily than the  
 second.

Dr Saunders argues eloquently that only bold moves will  
 strengthen the role of moderates. The rule of law and the  
 protection it offers must not be undermined by abuses under the

/law.

cell 4

disappointed  
COD  
22/4

ms



law. He draws a telling analogy with the Algerian experience, where the middle ground was lost to the extremists of left and right. He did not need to remind his audience that most white South Africans do not have the option of departure that was enjoyed by the colonial French.

Dr Saunders' speech is a good example of how far the debate on the future of South Africa has opened up, at least outside Government circles. Were the Government ready to think of responding as Dr Saunders suggests, the way would be open for the sort of dialogue that the Commonwealth Group of Eminent Persons is trying to promote.

Yours ever,

*A C Galsworthy*

(A C Galsworthy)  
Private Secretary

C D Powell Esq  
10 Downing Street

embargoed for publication until after delivered, at 8.15 p.m. on Thursday,  
(10th March, 1986)

PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS TO THE SOUTH AFRICAN INSTITUTE OF RACE RELATIONS

"SOUTH AFRICA : REFORM, RECONSTRUCTION AND THE MIDDLE GROUND"

BY

DR S J SAUNDERS, VICE-CHANCELLOR AND PRINCIPAL

UNIVERSITY OF CAPE TOWN

It is a great honour for me to deliver the Presidential Address to the South African Institute of Race Relations tonight.

In this address I will be simplistic in a number of respects inasmuch as I am afraid I will be stating the obvious, but it does seem to me that the obvious needs to be stated unequivocally in South Africa in 1986.

The Institute was founded to promote good race relations, implying also sound intergroup relations between people who have different cultural and historical backgrounds, and not only in the narrow, racial context. Good relationships between human beings result from complex and often fragile mutual interaction. No society can afford to lower its guard against the development of racial prejudices within it. While it is true that every individual must play his or her full part in promoting good relationships with people of another race or culture, in the end success in this crucial area is likely to

occur and to endure in a healthy society if the constitution of the country and the laws of the land allow it. It isn't enough to say that a legal system has a high reputation of independence if all that independence means is the application of racially discriminatory laws. It isn't enough to say that health services are available to all people or that the standard of living of South African blacks is higher than elsewhere in Africa if, in fact, the laws on the statute book are discriminatory. It is not enough to have noble words in a constitution if the constitution is not legitimate in the eyes of the people subject to it.

One often hears a plaintive question as to why South Africans are selected out for condemnation throughout the world. Why are the excesses of the Soviet Union ignored, or apparently ignored, in certain circumstances, or for example the excesses in Uganda? It is plain that the record of Uganda and of the Soviet Union and of many other countries in race and intergroup relations is abysmal and must be condemned, but it is also plain that South Africa is unique in as much as we have placed upon the statute book as a deliberate and public policy, discriminatory legislation which effectively keeps people in a subordinate and inferior position solely because they belong to another race.

So I would like to focus on the necessity of removing discriminatory legislation before we can talk about good race or intergroup relations in this country, but without ignoring or neglecting the enormous importance of developing good inter-personal and intergroup relations, quite apart from the legislation. But until the legislation is repealed, no high-sounding words will meet the needs of this country, and nobody, least of all the people in this country who are discriminated against in 1986, will be fooled by the rhetoric.

3.

Many of us were encouraged by both the style and the content of the State President's speech when he opened the South African Parliament on Friday, 31st January of this year. The full realisation of the promises and commitments, stated and implied in that speech, could indeed herald a new day for South Africa, and could revolutionize in a peaceful and constructive manner, race relations in this country. And so we should give every credit to the State President for making that speech in the way in which he did, but before we join the euphoric chorus, we should also note with great earnestness that 1986 will need to be marked by the commitments in that speech being given flesh and blood and structure in the form of the repeal of discriminatory legislation and clear moves towards a legitimate constitution. And we should wait to see whether those events occur, before we cynically disregard and reject what the State President said.

The speech committed the Government to the restoration of South African citizenship to those from whom it was arbitrarily and undemocratically taken away; the involvement of black communities in decision making; freehold property rights for members of black communities; the removal of existing influx control measures; an undivided South Africa with one citizenship; the sovereignty of law, and, I quote: "We believe the human dignity, life, liberty and property of all, must be protected, regardless of colour, race, creed or religion" and "We believe that a democratic system of government which must accommodate all legitimate political aspirations of all South African communities must be negotiated. All South Africans must be placed in a position where they can participate in government through their elected representatives." As I have said, the full realisation of those statements could transform the future of South Africa and enhance good race relations, but failure to give them legislative muscle and failure to repeal discriminatory legislation will do the reverse.

And we need to state clearly what we believe the words in the State President's speech to mean. Some years ago a young British political scientist who had made a special study of Kissinger's role in the then Rhodesia told me that Kissinger had used the English language like a political rapier. The precise use and meaning of words are crucial. Let us look at the meaning of some of the State President's words:

(i) "One citizenship for all South Africans"

I would suggest that "one citizenship for all South Africans" means that all citizens must have the same political rights, e.g. a real influence in the system of taxation; in determining foreign policy; and in the constitution of and control of the military. South African citizenship for all cannot simply mean all having the same passport - it is civil rights that determine citizenship whatever the constitutional framework through which they are exercised may be. The commitment to restore citizenship to black persons who forfeited it with the independence of Transkei, Bophuthatswana, Venda and Ciskei is to be welcomed but the restoration needs to be to a citizenship with civil rights. One should note that there was no consultation before the citizenship was removed.

(ii) "Removal of existing influx control measures".

Very simply, the pass laws and influx control must go. They must not be replaced by alternative discriminatory legislation or regulations. The average black man and woman must feel the enormous weight of the notorious dompas (passes) lifted from their backs. There must be no manœuvring by Government; no ifs and buts. And administrative delays about issuing identity documents to thirty million South Africans must not be allowed to delay this development. I am sure modern technology can speed things up enormously. And no discriminatory system must be allowed to replace the existing one. The State President said:  
"The present system has become too costly and has become obsolete".

It has become too costly not only in financial terms but most important of all in human ones.

(iii) "We believe in the sovereignty of the law as the basis for the protection of the fundamental rights of individuals as well as groups. We believe in the sanctity and indivisibility of law and the just application thereof. There can be no peace, freedom and democracy without law. Any future system must conform with the requirements of a civilized legal order, and must ensure access to the courts and equality before the law."

It was on June 15th, 1215 that King John signed the Magna Carta.

The document made it clear that there was a law that was above the king and which even he could not break. This reaffirmation of supreme law and its formulation in the charter that was still imperfect strengthened the rule of law initiated by Henry the Second. For the first time a king was himself bound by the law, and the charter became, in the words of Winston Churchill, an enduring witness that the "power of the crown was not absolute". Referring to Britain, Churchill went on: "And when in subsequent ages the State, swollen with its own authority, has attempted to ride roughshod over the rights or liberties of the subject, it is to this doctrine that appeal has again and again been made, and never yet without success." The barons of the thirteenth century realised that the rights of the individual had to be protected. That truism holds as strongly today as it did then, and the rule of law is an indispensable prerequisite to peace and prosperity in this country and to good race relations. Indeed the Old Testament emphasises the need the Israelites identified to have their kings kept in check and to uphold the Law. And the Rule of Law must include the restoration of habeas corpus, and the repeal of laws making possible detention without trial, house arrest, banning and other restrictions of human liberty not determined by the courts. The citizens must be protected by a Bill of Rights and an independent judiciary enshrined in the constitution to ensure that

the Rule of Law prevails.

- (iv) "Involvement of black communities in decision making" and "the restructuring of the system of provincial government to involve all communities" must mean equal involvement by all with ultimate decisions tested by a referendum or some other democratic voting procedure to ensure the legitimacy of the decisions.

And the system of local government must not result in a South Africa largely divided into impoverished and rich communities each being called in large part to provide development and other funds from local resources. The State President's statement regarding restructuring provincial government implies regionalisation and there is nothing wrong with that provided its base is geographic and not ethnic and provided all regions are economically viable.

- (v) "Freehold rights for members of black communities" must mean that land can be purchased in any area and occupancy must not be impeded by "orderly urbanisation".

And the meaning of all the other statements must imply full consultation with all sectors of society, the testing of decisions in a manner suggested above and the equal and even-handed application of the results to all irrespective of colour.

To make the words of the State President's speech of January 31 mean anything at all, the Group Areas Act and the Population Registration Act and the Natives Land Act must be repealed.

Without that the words will have a hollow ring.



What I am saying is that the State President's speech can be read in more than one way. Its implementation can only be successful if it means that South Africa moves completely away from making race the final determinant in all decisions in the political structures and replaces it by placing human rights and non-racial considerations on centre stage. The peaceful future of South Africa is dependant upon the State President's words as meaning that Government has made this fundamental shift. The failure of the South African Government to give such a reality to the content of that speech will do more damage to race relations in this country and to the future of us all than any other single event in recent times.

The speech claimed, and I quote:

"The 1983 Constitution proved within a year that our various communities can take part effectively and peacefully in joint decision-making at the central level."

One should add that the 1983 constitution, which is the present constitution of our country, is a racist constitution, and as such it is fatally flawed, as Dr Alan Paton rightly pointed out in his 1985 Hoernlé Lecture. It has given effect to a tricameral parliament based on race. It has excluded Africans completely from the centre of the legislative process, and has been one of the main sources of the upheavals and problems which beset our country in 1985 and 1986. We have had to come to grips with the nightmarish concept of "general affairs" and "own affairs" and, to quote from many people who have spoken to me, members of the Government and

senior officials: "We must make the constitution work."

It seems to me that it doesn't matter what the cost in human terms or in resources and money, but we are asked to "make the constitution work". My submission, like that of Paton, is that the constitution is unworkable, and I would add that it is increasing the bureaucracy enormously, that it is too costly in financial terms for the country, and that it is skewing national priorities.

Let us look at the question of education. I think without doubt most would agree that the problems in education are amongst the root causes of unhappiness which black South Africans have at this moment. We have a Department of National Education, "General Affairs". We have a Department of Education and Culture, House of Assembly, i.e. white "Own Affairs", a Department of Education and Culture, House of Representatives, i.e. coloured "Own Affairs", a Department of Education and Culture, House of Delegates, i.e. Asian "Own Affairs". We have numerous education departments in the "homelands" which are not yet independent, and we have departments of education in the "homelands" which have opted for independence. We have a Department of Education which expressly takes care of the needs of Africans within the Republic. The simple fact of the matter is that multiple departments of education at that level are costly and inefficient, and that South Africa simply does not have the manpower and the talent to staff those departments with people of adequate ability. It is just impossible. And ultimately, that whole machine must grind more and more slowly and more and more inefficiently. It is true that the Department of National Education "General Affairs" is taking more responsibility in increasing areas of common concern, but this does not alter the fact that we have a ridiculous superfluity of education departments. And the creation of a National Certifying Council and other structures cannot substitute for what, after all, was one of the fundamental recommendations of the Human Sciences Research Council's

Commission of Inquiry into the Provision of Education in the RSA, that there should be one ministry of education and one minister of education. Those words were not chosen by the HSRC committee members by chance. They weren't haphazard words. They were deliberate words, because the members of that committee foresaw the dangers of having multiple education departments and multiple ministers, and so they used the words deliberately: one ministry of education and one minister. And while it is true that serious attempts are being made to equalize standards and to bring equality into education, it simply won't wash that this can be achieved in the full sense of the word without one ministry and one minister. The Human Sciences Research Council's report dealt with the equal provision of education and that is what the one ministry must do. It is not enough to have one ministry for general policy and multiple ministries (and budgets) for the provision of education. As long as we have the present multiple system, we are going to have widespread dissatisfaction and unhappiness. It is part and parcel of a constitution which is based on race, and a constitution based on race is unhealthy for good race relations. It is another form of apartheid. Separate cannot be equal.

How long will it take, under ideal conditions, to ensure an equal provision of education for all people in South Africa? I think most people would answer by saying "two generations", so that for a long time many children in South Africa are going to get a sub-optimal education. And so South Africans need to believe that everything possible is being done to ensure that they reach that point of equal provision of education, as soon as possible, and they will only live with the inevitable long, lag period if they believe just that. If they suspect that there is any dragging of feet, or any lack of commitment, the wait will become intolerable. And I would submit that the one tangible way in which that commitment can be expressed, is to remove the racial connotations which are inherent in the present constitutional structure which places education as an "eie saak"

and therefore ethnically differentiated from parliament down. Until we move away from that system, we cannot have good race relations in this country, however much one consults, talks, debates and argues, or however much money one spends.

Of course it is commendable that so much more is being spent on black education at the moment than ever before. Of course it is commendable that major efforts are being undertaken to upgrade teacher qualifications, both by the State and by the private sector. But it is no accident that the tumult in South Africa has been focused on the schools ever since 1976, and highlighted in 1985. It is the perceptions of society that count, and you cannot fool the people of South Africa. They know what they are getting, and the crucial issue facing the country at the moment is to ensure that all the people of South Africa believe that every effort is being made to ensure a rapid march towards equality in education. Under the present dispensation at least one minister feels that he cannot talk to a statutory body which includes members who are members of another race group, because he is an "own affairs" minister, and yet that is the very group of people whom he should be consulting in making important decisions. The only logical way around that, of course, is to create yet another body representing one ethnic group only, and that would be to effect a major step backwards! The hamhandedness and intolerance shown by the Ministry of Education and Culture House of Representatives in relation to the educational needs of the coloured people should fill us all with a feeling of shame.

In contrast to what happened in "coloured" education Mr de Beer's, (the Deputy Minister concerned with African education), approach was more conciliatory and more intelligent and enabled the sensible leadership given by the Soweto Parents Crisis Committee to be heeded by black scholars in South Africa. As I write this it is not clear how many of the

requests of the SPCC will be met, but at least they are negotiable and one hopes that a result acceptable to all will be achieved.

And another fundamental danger of our present constitution came to light when a group of us appealed to the State President to intervene to help to resolve the crisis in coloured education in the Western Cape. It became apparent that the decisions concerning coloured education were to be made exclusively by those in power in the House of Representatives. Now, if the coloured community were living in a country all by themselves, one could see the logic of that, but it does not. No man is an island, and what happens in coloured education impinges very much upon what happens in the education of everybody in South Africa, and it seems to me that this is an enormous danger because it is not only in education that this situation can arise. This does not mean that I believe that all power should be centralised in Pretoria. Power can be decentralised - and education is an area where this might be appropriate - but the criteria of decentralisation are important. These include the scope of the authority decentralised and the legitimacy of the institutions to which power is to be decentralised. These cannot be determined by racial criteria, by a white parliament, nor can the authority be one like the Ministers Council of the House of Delegates, which does not enjoy legitimacy. Let us not forget that while the whites held a referendum to approve the 1983 constitution, no one else did so. And the limits of authority in education are circumscribed by, inter alia, the National Policy Education Act and own schools policy enacted by a white parliament under the old constitution.

The most striking additional example of the danger of the present constitution lies in the field of health. For a long time South Africa has had a fragmented health service. We have the State Health Department, primarily responsible for preventive health, forensic medicine and mental

12.

health services; we have the second level of Provincial Government responsible for curative health, and we have the local authorities which are also running preventive health clinics, etc. This three-tiered system has itself been inefficient and costly, and has been criticized by the medical profession from time to time. On top of this it seems likely that a system of "own affairs" and "general affairs" will be grafted, so it seems probable that we are to have hospitals in this country which will be white "own affairs" hospitals, hospitals which will be coloured "own affairs" hospitals, Indian "own affairs" hospitals, and "general affairs" hospitals. I don't understand how anybody can conceive of a system of health service delivery which is fragmented vertically and horizontally. It seems to me, and it seems to, as far as I know, every medical faculty in this country, and certainly to every principal of every university with a medical faculty in this country, that the only way to move forward is to have one health service and one administration and that it should all, therefore, be "general affairs". I know of no one in government or out of it who has experience in health service delivery, who will defend "own affairs" and "general affairs" hospitals and who will say that this system of "own" and "general affairs" health services is in the best interests of South Africa or the best way to meet the health requirements of this country. I defy any of my medical colleagues from the Minister down to stand up and say publicly that their preferred option is to have "own affairs" and "general affairs" hospitals. I have not met anybody who says it privately. Why then should we distort and damage the health services of this country, health services which have won us high praise, which have commendably given care to people of all races. In a country as big as South Africa there inevitably will be some disparities, but by and large the curative health service provision, certainly in the urban areas, has been very good and has brought us great credit, and when it has been investigated, has not been found to be wanting. There are exceptions, but

no society is perfect. For example, there is much to be done in improving health care in rural areas. But we are now to dismantle this and tamper with it and divide it into a fragmented, racially oriented, health service delivery system. It is indefensible. It will be inefficient. It raises important ethical questions for the medical profession. There have been attempts to reserve Coronation Hospital for coloured people and to move black and Indian patients elsewhere. What sort of nonsense is this? The division of health services into "general" and "own" affairs will result in increasing the size of the civil service and the bureaucracy, and it will correctly be roundly condemned by everyone who has insight into these matters, both in South Africa and throughout the world, and it will bring the medical profession in South Africa into question on ethical grounds. It is an example of our confounded constitution skewing national priorities. And it is an example of the difficulty that arises if you have a fatally flawed system. My submission is again that the constitution is at the root of the problem, because it is based on race, and not on what is in the best interests of all the people in South Africa.

As I am not a water engineer, and as I do not know very much about the distribution, reticulation and provision of water for human and industrial consumption, I shan't pass comment on the fact that this is also an "own affairs" matter, but I wait with interest to see how the water provision to different communities in the Cape Peninsula, for example, is divided up between the different administrations. "That's nothing to what I could say if I chose" (Lewis Carroll).

Good race relations and a happy future for this country are impossible without the involvement of black South Africans at the centre of legislative power, which brings me back again to our present constitution. Even if Africans were represented in a fourth chamber, they would not be at the centre of legislative power, because the fact of the matter is that under

Those are three small examples which have an enormous symbolic significance, and we mustn't overlook the importance of symbolism in promoting good race relations. Not only must racially discriminatory legislation be repealed, but there must be positive legislation to enhance good race relations, and in the ordinary little things, the symbolism, particularly on the part of government and leaders in the community, must be such as to make it plain to everybody that racial prejudice is a thing of the past. The credibility of the Government's commitment to reform was badly dented in the eyes of many by Minister de Klerk's contribution to the No Confidence Debate and by the repudiation of Minister Pik Botha by the State President. For the sake of all South Africans we can only hope that those events reflected political strategy designed for conservative white consumption and not the conviction of the Government.

Talking of symbols, there can be no question but that the repeal of the Mixed Marriages Act and the Immorality Act were examples of the removal of discriminatory legislation by Act of Parliament for the first time, and as such has great symbolical significance.

We have to persuade as many of the various political groups as possible, both parliamentary and extra-parliamentary, to enter real dialogue and debate and diminish the influence of extremists on both sides. Hence the need to strengthen the middle ground - an area in which I believe the SAIRR could play some part.

What constitutes the middle ground in South Africa in the second half of the '80s, and what should it do? Broadly it consists of all those groupings and individuals who share the concepts of citizenship and democracy I have tried to clarify tonight, and who believe that change should be achieved peacefully through negotiation. They would include groups and organisations



both in and out of parliament. Parliament has a fundamentally important role to play in this process, but so do forces outside of it, and there is nothing undemocratic about that at all. Indeed it is part and parcel of the democratic process as shown for example by the consumer and ecological groups in the USA and elsewhere. When most of the people living in this country have no real political rights at all, when Africans have no role in Parliament, coloured and Indian people have little real power, then the extra-parliamentary political process becomes much more important and crucial in the process of change. It is essential to strengthen the middle ground as much as possible and to promote the in-depth discussions and debate which may be able to lead us to a peaceful future.

With regard to the importance of the moderate centre and historical threats to it, it is instructive to examine how extremists of the right and the left have come into power during the twentieth century, and the fate of the middle ground in each instance. The centre ground of the Weimar Republic was occupied by the Social Democrats, crippled by the dreadful economic situation of Germany at that time, and other inheritances from the Versailles peace treaty at the end of the First World War. Through intrigue and street violence, the Communists and the Fascists steadily eroded the centre, and no statesman appeared at the leadership of the Social Democrats who could inspire the German people and counteract the excesses of the left or the right. Tragically, Konrad Adenauer's attempt to form a centre coalition in 1926 failed, partly because of the actions of Gustav Stresemann, the then Foreign Minister, and Ernst Scholtz, the leader of the People's Party. There had been considerable economic improvement in Germany during the rule by the centre in the second half of the 1920s. But partly because of internecine strife amongst the Social Democrats, the centre did not hold. Indeed, a few years earlier the same Gustav Stresemann had formed a "great coalition" including the Social Democrats and the moderates to the right of them, but it was only able to remain intact for a hundred days. The failure of the centre of the Weimar

Republic made it much easier for Hitler to come to power, and once there, he ruthlessly and deliberately eliminated all moderate opposition.

In Russia, Lenin progressively and systematically destroyed the moderate centre, including eliminating anyone within his own organisation who didn't take an extreme view. He and Stalin and their successors ruthlessly eliminated any moderate opposition, and as in the case of anyone who holds total power, extended it widely into Russian society, with the resultant murder, deportation or incarceration of millions of people.

As with the Nazis, the Soviet Communists eliminated people in groups, and largely not because of alleged personal guilt or responsibility, perhaps the most frightening aspect of it all. In both instances the Jews, and in the case of Russia, high-school teachers, parish councils, priests, trade union officials, and many others, were destroyed as groups.

Paul Johnson's analysis of what happened in Algeria is instructive. On 1st November 1954 Ben Bella joined up with Belkacem Krim and launched a national rising. Their objective was not to confront directly and to attempt to defeat the French army because that was beyond their means, but rather to destroy any possibility of a multiracial society emerging in Algeria, by eliminating the moderates on both sides. The first casualty was the French liberal, Guy Monnerot. He was a school teacher, popular with the Arabs. On the Arab side, the first to die was the pro-French local governor, Hadj Sakok. For the most part the FLN acted against those Muslims who showed any loyalty to France, and they employed the tactics of torture and murder on a large scale. As Johnson points out, Ben Bella's written orders included: "Liquidate all personalities who want to play the role of interlocuteur valable"; "Kill any person attempting to deflect the militants, and inculcate them with a bourguibien spirit"; "Kill the Caid. Take their children and kill them.

Kill all those who pay taxes and those who collect them. Burn the houses of the Muslim NCOs away on active service". In the first two and a half

years of the war, they murdered 1 035 whites, and 6 352 Arabs, although it is speculated that the figure was closer to 20 000. The only way for moderates to survive was either by joining the extremists or leaving the country.

The French response was to act with terror on an equal scale. In a fatal decision the Governor-General, Lacoste, gave General Massu freedom of action to deal with the FLN in Algiers. The result was that the security forces were no longer under the control of the civil government, and their excesses are well documented. In the end the destruction of the centre ground left the FLN in control of Algiers after de Gaulle's return to power, and his subsequent actions, which extricated France from the Algerian problem, included on his part, a fair amount of double talk. We must ensure that the moderate centre is strengthened in South Africa and give it credibility so that it is not seen as a "holding action" but as intent on reconstruction.

We are dealing with human beings, and human beings must operate within defined structures which protect them from one another. For example, accounting procedures must ensure that the occasional person tempted to commit fraud or to swindle the company is protected against himself or herself. The system is important. The same applies for all the conditions of men and women, whether it be the way in which a school is organised or the way in which a police force is run: there must be checks and balances and the system must protect the individuals within the system and the individuals affected by it. One cannot rely on goodwill; one cannot rely on good intentions. The structure is vital. It is essential for the security forces of any nation to remain firmly and clearly under civilian control. Not only must this be the case, but it must be seen to be the case. The grossness of some of their actions takes one's breath away. The "T shirt" ban in the Western Cape is a good example of the unbridled use of power and that sort of action brings all law enforcement into disrepute and ridicule.

The security forces in South Africa have enormous powers which are, of course, increased in areas where a state of emergency applies.

Procedures such as detention without trial, severe restrictions placed upon individuals who are technically at liberty, and banning orders, may have some success in the short-term, but in the long-term can only aggravate the situation.

The upheavals in South Africa during 1985, including widespread school and consumer boycotts, were ostensibly controlled by such draconian measures, but the heritage of excessive use of force and widespread detentions is a very worrying one.

As an educationalist, I can only express my deepest concern at the fact that school examinations took place under police guard and that policemen were actually in examination halls while children were writing. More importantly, the repeated accusations of excessive use of force on the part of the police, including actions by the police against students of my own university, which were completely unjustified, indicate very clearly the dangers of giving undue, inadequately controlled authority, to any security force. To my knowledge, the Minister of Police and the Cabinet have at no time in the past years publicly criticised or reprimanded a security force officer. I repeat, not only must civilian control be effective, but it must be seen by all the citizens of a country to be effective. And indeed there is an urgent need for the restoration of the rule of law in South Africa.

It is idle to think that the root causes of the troubled times which we saw in 1985 are the result of intimidators and agitators, and that long-term solutions can result from actions of the security forces. When people really believe that they are facing a just and secure future, it will be very difficult for large numbers of citizens in this country to be mobilised in such a way that they will indulge in anti-social and violent acts. And we must all be aghast at the death and destruction in South Africa in recent times. Because of apartheid the white people of South Africa have largely been insulated from the violence and its consequences.

democracy and like the social engineering of the Soviet Union are unacceptable  
to all democrats. The Government's commitment to stop them is a welcome  
development.

The lessons from Algeria and elsewhere are clear. Failure to  
introduce necessary reforms, coupled with the excessive use of force on the  
part of the police and army, simply play into the hands of the extreme  
revolutionaries. In 1985 we witnessed dreadful events in which members of  
communities turned upon each other with torture and murder. Tensions ran  
high amongst the so-called coloured people of the Western Cape as a result  
of the upheavals in the school system, and the tension was greatly exacerbated,  
not only by the actions of the security forces, but also by the actions of the  
Department of Education and Culture of the House of Representatives, which set  
itself the task of acting in a punitive fashion against both scholars and  
teachers. Impediments were put in the way of scholars who wished to write  
supplementary examinations, and teachers were summarily suspended. The  
headmaster and departmental heads of one of the leading coloured schools in the  
Peninsula were suspended, people who had given years of their lives to education;  
and had developed and maintained the highest possible standards of secondary  
school education; members of society who rightly enjoy the respect of their  
community and of all right-minded South Africans. Why was it necessary to  
summarily suspend such outstanding men and women?

There is no perfect and there is no absolutely secure future  
anywhere in the world, but the constitutions and systems of government can  
help to make the future more likely to be a happy one.

It seems clear that without healthy economic growth we are  
unlikely to solve South Africa's problems peacefully, which is something  
which those who seek to damage the South African economy by sanctions and  
other methods should pause and give thought to. The threat of economic  
sanctions, disinvestment and divestment to encourage reform is one thing;

the reality of comprehensive and effective sanctions would be quite another.

Some place the unemployment figure in the Port Elizabeth/Uitenhage area at between 50% and 60%. Those who seek to damage the South African motor industry, for example, have to face the reality that real human misery and starvation will result, and that this will certainly not strengthen the middle ground. And the debate in the middle ground must concern economic as well as political futures for South Africa.

And South Africa's future is inextricably bound up with the demographic realities where the predictions are that the present population will increase frighteningly by the year 2 000. Education and employment opportunities will therefore be needed on an incredibly large scale, and as with the rest of the world where the birthrates are high, it is in everyone's interest to control excessive population growth as much as possible, otherwise whatever we do and whatever solution is found, will in the end be inadequate, purely in terms of physical survival. The problems of over-population and population growth tend to be pushed into the background in national and international debates concerning the future of nations, and yet it should be on centre stage as one of the major problems facing mankind.

The Nationalist Government is like a colonial power in South Africa, analogous to the earlier British colonial power in this country or elsewhere in the world at the time of the British Raj. I am not convinced that they are really in touch with the real current opinions and values of South African blacks. It seems to me that real dialogue between those whites in power and the authentic voices of black South Africans is urgently needed. The middle ground must help to promote that.

I believe that if South African blacks do not have to carry passes after July 1, if they are no longer harassed by the police and others for failing to do so, if they can seek work where they will, if the level of unemployment drops, and if they believe that the Government is committed to

reconstruction, they will not expect miracles overnight. It is going to be a long haul and it is in the hands of the South African Government to effect peaceful change. That is why it is so vital for the statements of the State President to be realised. South Africans must understand that a society based on racial discrimination is not acceptable in the modern world and cannot endure.

We have to strengthen the middle ground to help to achieve the dream we all have of South Africa. And if substance is given to the rhetoric and we do move away from our obsession with race and make human rights the basis of our society, we must not be slow in our praise of those who have the courage to embark on reconstruction.

Let us remember the first verse of Yeats' poem:

"Turning and turning in the widening gyre  
the falcon cannot hear the falconer;  
Things fall apart; the centre cannot hold;  
Mere anarchy is loosed upon the world,  
The blood-dimmed tide is loosed, and everywhere  
The ceremony of innocence is drowned;  
The best lack all conviction, while the worst  
Are full of passionate intensity."

If we do not want the hour of Yeats' "rough beast" to come with escalating violence and confrontation in South Africa, we must strengthen and encourage the forces advocating a non-racial future. I hope the South African Institute of Race Relations will play its part in this challenging task.

SJS/cmw

6/3/86

