

The Eye of the Needle

PREFACE

What is it that fascinates us so about South Africa? One thing, we would suggest, is that when Americans look at South Africa we are transfixed by what seems the nightmare exaggeration of our own racial troubles.

Another is the sensation that a cosmic drama is being played out there—black against white, integration versus separatism, democracy against totalitarianism, Christian forces against the state, perhaps capitalism against socialism; that events almost beyond human control are hastening humankind—where? to the disaster of racial war? to a new discovery of the human family?

The Eye of the Needle is more than a book about South Africa. It is also a careful examination of capitalism in the light of Christian ethics, and it is a proposal for a radically different politico-economic system which its author believes is the only one compatible with Christian ideals. But it is indisputably a book about South Africa, so it is in that light that we wish first to look at the book.

On October 19, 1977, the Christian Institute was outlawed by the South African government. But for fifteen years prior to that this heroic group of Christians of all races, under the leadership of [Beyers Naude](#), a minister of the [Dutch Reformed Church](#), had raised a prophetic voice to warn that the racial policies of South Africa are idolatrous. *The Eye of the Needle* was initially published by the Christian Institute as part of a study project devoted to reconciliation, association, and love in a society permeated with hostility, separation, and domination.

"Separate development" and "multinational development" are the names now preferred by those in South Africa who support what is generally called "apartheid." But "apartheid" characterizes South Africa's racial policies aptly enough, since in the Dutch-derived Afrikaans language that South Africa's dominant white group speak it means simply "apartness." It denotes the policy of separate but not equal that has been practiced toward people of color since Europeans arrived in the seventeenth century, but which the National Party government has methodically rigidified into law. Not only the apartness but the inequality is evident and enforced throughout South African society. Each population group must keep to itself except in activities that serve the ends of white domination, for instance, when an African woman prepares the food, cleans the house, and cares for the children of a white family or when an African male provides the unskilled labor that undergirds South Africa's industrial prosperity.

South Africa, like the world, is a patchwork of peoples.

Racially, of its 25 million people about 71 percent are African, 17 percent of European ancestry, 9 percent of the mixed ancestry classified officially as "Coloured," and 3 percent Indian or Asian. The official posture of the Nationalist government is that each of the racial communities is developing its own separate political structure within which it will eventually be sovereign over its own affairs. But what we are supposed to envision is quite different from what has happened to date. The 83 percent of the people classified as "non-white" cannot vote for a Parliament that writes laws for 100 percent of the population; thus every law is arbitrary for the 83 percent. Although Africans have "homelands" in such Bantustans as KwaZulu, where all Africans must establish citizenship even if they have lived all their lives in a township near Johannesburg or Durban, and although the "Coloured" and Indian populations do have Advisory Councils to suggest policies and perhaps mollify their impact—what the government calls "parallel development"—there is never any doubt in anyone's mind about who sets policy and enforces it. Although the Transkei was declared in 1976 to be a sovereign and independent state, no longer part of the Republic of South Africa, only South Africa of all the nations in the world sees it as such. African leaders representing seven of the other eight Bantustans issued a statement saying that they want nothing to do with this type of "independence." "We do not want,"

The Eye of the Needle

they told the government, "to abdicate our birthright as South Africans, as well as forfeiting our share of the economy and wealth which we have jointly built." The prospects for this apartheid strategy are discussed by [Richard Turner](#) in his Postscript.

Throughout the rest of South Africa every aspect of life for those classified as "non-white" comes under domination. The Immorality Act forbids interracial sexual relations. The Group Areas Act and the policy of resettlement allow the government arbitrarily to shift families from one neighborhood to another or from their homes to remote Bantustans. The policy of migrant labor, which is a necessary adjunct to this enforced removal, separates fathers from their families for most of the year. Widespread police payoffs to individuals for spying on others, including their pastors, teachers, and fellow students, extend government control even to the normally private areas of life. Laws that reserve jobs to particular race groups and restrict union activities control the economic life of "non-whites," helping to maintain a white-African family income ratio of 8: 1. "[Bantu Education](#)" is carefully controlled by the white government; its critics charge that it is designed to socialize African children into a controlled society, supplying minimal skills that will be of service within that society, but avoiding the kind of liberal education that would encourage independent thought. Finally, most hated by Africans among the hundreds of apartheid laws are the pass laws, which require each adult African in "white areas" to carry an elaborate reference book that must be signed regularly by a white employer. Failure to carry the book at all times or to keep it up to date can mean a fine or imprisonment or being "endorsed out," which, in accordance with influx control laws, forces the African to move to a Bantustan.

Since 1948, when the National Party was empowered by South Africa's white voters to begin putting its calculated program of apartheid into operation, there has seldom been any uncertainty what the major problem of South Africa is. Surely it is *race*, observers both inside and outside the country have assumed. And the alternative ways of coping with it could only be two: the government's way of apartheid or integration American-style into a society where considerations of race would eventually disappear.

Since these represent ideologically opposite positions, it is not surprising that discussion got nowhere; change in South Africa after 1948 was almost always determined by the government's monopoly of power.

But in 1972 and early 1973, when the authors of this Preface were in South Africa, we began to hear knowledgeable South Africans say, "Ah, but that may be a false analysis. Have you read *The Eye of the Needle*?" This small book had been published in 1972 by Sprocas, a study project set up by the Christian Institute.

Briefly, the book's thesis is that South Africa's problem is not at its root racial but economic, and that correct as they are about the injustice of apartheid, the liberals' program would never work, even if by some miracle they should succeed in making it the policy of the country, because it would only induct a few blacks into the privileged class while leaving intact the real mechanism of oppression, exploitative capitalism.

The proponent of this thesis is Richard Turner, a young lecturer in political science at the University of Natal in Durban. His proposed solution for his country is a socialist democracy in which worker-owned-and-controlled industries would be the basis of economic and political power. Whether one calls present policy by the old name of "apartheid" or the more palatable "separate development," it is designed, Turner argues, to legitimize Nationalist Party control while gluing the white minority together politically and promoting a divide-and-conquer domination over blacks.

Critics of government policy, such as Turner, have been nettles in the regime's thin skin, but since the 1950 enactment of the Suppression of Communism Act the government, when vexed, can shed irritating dissenters

The Eye of the Needle

by means of a "ban."

Richard Turner was banned on February 28, 1973, along with the leadership of the [National Union of South African Students](#) (NUSAS), an organization he served as faculty advisor. His banning orders begin, "Whereas I, Petrus Cornelius Pelsler, Minister of Justice, am satisfied that you engage in activities which are furthering or may further the achievement of the objects of communism . . ." But "communism" by the 1950 act is conveniently defined as "any doctrine or scheme which aims at bringing about any political, industrial, social, or economic change within the Republic by the promotion of disturbance or disorder." Beyond the minister's satisfaction that the act has been violated, no proof is required, and his decision cannot be tested in the courts.

In short, Turner is prohibited by his five-year banning orders from attending any "gathering," which is understood to mean three or more persons including the banned person. When Turner has a visitor in his home, who incidentally might be discouraged by the presence of Special Branch policemen watching from cars nearby, his wife will leave the room in order that there be no "gathering."

The orders also prohibit Turner from leaving Durban and from "being within any place or area which constitutes the premises on which any public or private university... is situate; any place which constitutes the premises of the National Union of South African Students," any place where publications are being compiled or published, any factory, any harbor, and any non-white area. He is prevented from joining any association of students or scholars; from communicating with any "named" person (anyone banned or otherwise listed by the government); from contributing in any way to the preparation of any publication; from transmitting any document, book, pamphlet, poster, or drawing in which the State or its policies are defended, criticized, or even referred to, or any which "is likely to engender feelings of hostility between the White and the non-White inhabitants of the Republic of South Africa." Although he remains a member of the university faculty, he is prohibited from giving any educational instruction. Finally, he may not be quoted in public, which means among other things that from the moment he was banned it was a crime to circulate anything he had written or said. All publications which merely quote Turner are thereby banned also until the offending quotation is expunged. The day after Turner was banned, *The Eye of the Needle* was removed from the shelves of South African bookstores and libraries. "We don't keep a large inventory of books likely to be banned," a bookstore salesclerk explained, "since we take a loss on them."

Thus the banned individual becomes a political non-person without the government having to lay out a cent for prison bed and board. There are at least four hundred banned persons in South Africa, most of them black, in addition to many in prison for long terms because of their political activities; at this writing there are several hundred individuals who are being held in-communicado with no charges filed against them.

The circumstances of Turner's banning make it clear that it was his ideas the regime feared, especially the possibility that they might spread among militant blacks. Not only from the government, but also from the opposition United Party, which considered itself guardian of business and industrial interests, there went up the cry, "Black socialism!" Those who were not appalled by the noun were made to shudder by the adjective. In a parliamentary investigation of NUSAS by the Schibusch Commission, Turner was portrayed as the corrupter of youth. Although he grew up, and for several years managed a farm, near Stellenbosch, which should ordinarily put him in good Boer company, the Commission had no trouble ferreting out, at least to their satisfaction, the source of his apparently un-South African ideas. After finishing a degree at the University of Cape Town, which as an English-speaking institution is hazardous enough in the eyes of any Afrikaner nationalist, Turner fell into the quick sands of political recusancy in France, where he finished his doctorate at the Sorbonne in 1966 with a dissertation, to make matters even worse, on the Marxist Jean-Paul Sartre.

The Eye of the Needle

"Since his return to South Africa," the Commission divulged to Parliament in its confidential report, "Turner has concentrated intensively on the political cultivation of students, [and] . . . plays the role of activist." The Commission unfolded what they dubbed a "tale of his propagation during the past years of his political view, which is nothing other than radical revolutionary theory," by recounting his activities, in addition to his "daily task" of teaching: speaking on other campuses and at NUSAS meetings, advising NUSAS officials "on all kinds of matters," and writing. "He influences individual students both in and outside his classes." To support their judgment that Turner trapped students in a net of dangerous theory, the Commission quoted from various speeches, writings, and personal letters, including some which had never left Turner's office until, apparently, the Bureau of State Security (BOSS) discovered them.

Most of the books about South Africa that come our way describe the evils of apartheid, often from the vantage point of some visitor to the country. But Turner writes as a South African to South Africans who are familiar enough with the surface phenomena of apartheid. He asks his readers rather to adopt a theoretical attitude, to inquire with him why such a system exists and why it is so resistant to change. His answer is that it exists for the economic advantage of those who perpetrate it. If we accept this analysis, we will have to reject or at least subordinate the more hallowed explanation that apartheid is caused by the strong racial antipathies of South Africa's whites. Race, in Turner's view, is distinctly secondary to the class discrimination that accompanies the economic exploitation of one group by another.

If Turner is right about the relative roles that race and economics play in South Africa, then the same thing must be true of the United States, because Turner does not base this part of his analysis upon the peculiar history of South Africa, but upon the particular value pattern that was carried by Western European "civilization" wherever it went in the world. This was the drive to seek satisfaction in the accumulation of material goods rather than in relations with other people. But it is this set of values that underlies capitalism. It is in the nature of capitalism, it is the way it is set up to work, Turner would argue, that a minority exploits a majority and presumably uses various rationales to conceal or justify it. One of these is race.

Americans will miss the full impact of this if we think of the United States as a self-contained economic unit.

To be sure, the poor are always with us, but they are a distinct minority and if we have seen to it that the poverty group is not the same, at least not always the same, as a particular racial group, we have done enough, many will feel. But have we managed to include the American worker for a healthy cut of the "bread" only by basing our economy on the exploitation of the masses in other countries, including South Africa? As we are forced more and more by the pressure of events to see the world as a single economy, are we going to discover that Marx was right after all and that capitalism depends for its very life on sucking the blood of the masses?

So we see that while Turner is writing about South Africa, he is doing so in a way that pulls all of us into a whirlpool of questions about our values, our politics, and our economic dealings with other people. If Turner is right, then when we follow down the accusing finger that we point at South Africa's whites, we find at the end—ourselves!

Those readers whose major concern is the present politics of South Africa will find the Postscript the most interesting part of the book. Those who feel uninformed about South Africa may even wish, after finishing this Preface, to read the Postscript before taking up the body of the book. The Postscript was not a part of *The Eye of the Needle* as published in South Africa; it is published here for the first time. It is dated just sixteen days before Turner's banning. In *The Eye of the Needle*, Turner had analyzed the South African situation and proposed what he recognized as a Utopian solution. He adds the Postscript to address what he calls "the enormous problem of how to bring such a society into existence in South Africa."

The Eye of the Needle

There can be no doubt that the government is aware of the existence of Turner's Postscript. Its interest was revealed during a 1976 trial of the members of two African organizations, the Black Peoples' Convention and the South African Student Organization, when Turner took the stand as a witness for the defense. Although hardly germane to the trial, much of the prosecutor's questioning dwelled on *The Eye of the Needle*, its Post-script, details of when the Postscript was written, and facts about how Turner put it in the hands of "an American professor" who desired to see it published. The prosecutor was, of course, attempting to ferret out evidence that Turner might have violated some modicum of his banning orders by either working on a manuscript or contributing to its publication. Then the prosecutor turned toward Turner's intentions in writing a Post-script and what its title, "The Present as History," might mean. Turner replied that the title was an attempt toward "grasping the present as a process of change" and that "what I tried to do in this was to say:

Look, if you are thinking about bringing about change in South Africa, these are the sorts of realities of the South African situation, realities inhibiting change, realities of various sorts possibly furthering change, that need to be taken into consideration."

The pages Turner added contain what in the opinion of the present writers is the clearest analysis in print of the dynamics of change in South Africa. It points emphatically to the growing value of the Africans' labor as the one tool by which they may eventually hope to break the white monopoly of political power. The implication is clear for those outside South Africa who wish to contribute to change within the Republic by peaceful means: They must seek ways to abet the organization and political consciousness of the African labor force.

Rather than reading *The Eye of the Needle* for what it has to say about South Africa, one may choose to read it as a penetrating examination of capitalism in the light of Christian ethics. When read with this aim, South Africa serves only as a case study, but as a particularly apt one because in that country we see capitalism working as Marx and other critics had seen it, without the protection afforded the laborer by the counter-power of unions. Whether this is "true capitalism" may indeed be questioned, especially since the South African government intervenes on the other side to protect the owners and white laborers against blacks taking full advantage of the value of their labor, even figured in capitalistic terms. But at least in South Africa we see capitalism as much of the underdeveloped world sees it: The whites of the western countries through the device of ownership of resources, which they have in fact seized by force from the non-whites of the world (America being no exception), require the labor of those they have robbed on terms that keep the whites rich and the rest of the world poor. *The Eye of the Needle* confronts us with the question whether capitalism can be conceptually separated from imperialism; otherwise put, has capitalism avoided a manifestly exploited proletariat in the developed countries only by producing one in Africa, Asia, and Latin America? If so, then South Africa is a microcosm of the world.

Thus we see that, read as a study of economic systems, the book is as relevant to Americans as to South Africans. Moreover, it fills a peculiar need. Christians in capitalist countries have exhibited genuine concern for world economic justice, but have been curiously loath to bring under examination whether the economic system that has developed among them may be incompatible with economic justice. In U.S. churches (synagogues too) one can cause greater consternation by proclaiming, "I don't believe in capitalism," than by announcing, "I don't believe in God." This is all the more curious when one recalls that the earliest Christians "had all things in common, and they sold their possessions and goods and distributed them to all, as any had need" (Acts 2:44 - 45), and that capitalism as a system has developed only in recent centuries, largely without conscious choice, and at first against the active discouragement of a church that taught that it was a sin to make money from money.

The Eye of the Needle

We are not here assuming the truth of Turner's argument. In fact we have misgivings about some points of it.

But we have no question whatsoever that this discussion needs to take place and that this book can be a valuable aid to it. Few of us in the capitalist countries even know the theoretical basis of Marxist criticism of capitalism, which Turner presents with admirable simplicity in his second chapter.

Richard Turner is not a Communist. Communism, like capitalism, sees people as basically economic animals; Turner accepts the Christian view that people find their fulfilment in loving relationships with other people.

When he looks for living instances of his proposed worker-run industry, Turner finds that almost everywhere in Communist countries the model is obscured by the priority given to the Communist party organization, Turner is a humanistically trained social philosopher who borrows heavily from Marxian insights in his interpretations of political and economic reality. If we wish on this basis to call him a Marxist, we should be aware that he has many fellows among reputable thinkers of all non-Communist countries, and that the tradition of Christian socialism is already an honored one.

It may be that present readers are not used to having political and economic proposals subjected to what amounts to a theological examination. Here white South Africa may have something of value to share with us, namely, assistance in recovering our theological traditions. South Africa is a land where church life retains a great deal of vigor. It is the more important for the opponents of apartheid to know their theology because its supporters—overwhelmingly the Afrikaner Calvinists—are inclined to insist that all of life be ordered on the basis of theology, and to believe that their own theology gives them a mandate to order life for all other groups. Whether there really are two irreconcilable theologies involved is a question of great consequence for South Africa.

Implicit in what we have already said is that *The Eye of the Needle* may be read with profit by those whose chief interest is neither in South Africa nor in a Christian critique of capitalism, but in social and political theory. Turner's participatory socialist democracy is a modern Utopia. To be sure, he doesn't give very specific directions as to how it can be brought about, especially within the political straitjacket that is South Africa, but this is not a requirement of Utopias. One has only to refer to Plato's *Republic*, for example, or to B.F. Skinner's *Walden Two*, to be reminded that the power of social models does not depend upon the practicability of bringing them into existence. Turner will be content, he says, if he can convince us that it *could* be, by which he means only that "there are neither imperatives of organization nor imperatives of human nature which would prevent such a society from operating once it came into existence."

Nevertheless, it is evident that Turner does have a faith, almost in spite of the evidence, that change can come even in South Africa. For one thing, he knows that the alternative is equally impractical—namely, that present inequalities should continue in South Africa and in the world. As he says in the closing passage of the book, "How practical is it to want a second car when the world is running out of petrol? How practical is it to try to pass a camel through the eye of a needle?" This reference to Jesus' saying—"It is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle than for a rich man to enter the kingdom of God" (Matt. 19:24)—suggests that it is just this impractical practicality that Turner is alluding to in the title of his book.

This leads to the question whether in fact Turner anticipates a violent revolution that will put blacks in a position to set up an entirely new political structure.

The answer is no. He specifically says in the Postscript that "white dominance in South Africa is so militarily entrenched that it cannot possibly be threatened by violent overthrow." In the book itself he points rather to long-range changes of attitude and lifestyle such as would be nurtured through education, mentioning

The Eye of the Needle

particularly the role the church can play in this regard. In fact he says, "If the Christian churches can rediscover their transcendence and show the meaning of love to white South Africans then a peaceful resolution of the struggle will be possible." But the "if" needs to be underscored. The churches might perhaps make this kind of impact on white South Africa if the Afrikaner churches were enthusiastically involved, but until now they have provided the theological justification for apartheid and have chosen to isolate themselves from other churches both inside and outside South Africa rather than give up their belief in racial separation. In the Postscript, after a wide-ranging assessment of the possibilities of change, Turner says more realistically, "White South Africans are not going to give up power voluntarily, either as a result of lessons in the meaning of race or as a result of lectures on Christian ethics" (a possible reference to his own book) What hope then? For Turner it lies in "the changing network of power-relationships" brought about by the increased bargaining power of a growing African labor force. But he warns that such change will be slow, the hope of achieving his model a distant one. Our conclusion is that if Rick Turner has been banned because the South African government thought he was preaching violent revolution, it can only be because the decision-makers know that they would never accept his suggested changes without a fight, and not because Turner has advocated fighting to achieve them.

Since Turner wrote his Postscript the imponderables in South Africa's future have become fewer by one.

Turner's analysis of the weakness of Portugal's position in Africa has proven correct. The hated "terrorists," who a short while ago were far away in the northern reaches of neighboring countries, now, as a result of the abrupt Portuguese abandonment of the continent, are ensconced in political power on South Africa's own borders. Mozambique, whose capital city of Maputo provides South Africa the closest seaport to its industrial concentration in the Southern Transvaal, is now under a black Marxist government. In Angola, as Turner was writing, a half-million Europeans lived pleasantly in what they thought was a fraternal relationship with black Africans; with the approach of independence most of them fled in panic, leaving the rich country to be fought over by rival black factions. Finally that faction that was supported by the Soviet Union gained political control of Angola with the aid of some fifteen thousand Cuban troops, which remained to shore up the shaky government against continued resistance.

The change in the mood of South Africa's white population is perceptible. All eyes turn northward. South Africa's whites now know that they stand alone on the African continent and that if they survive, it will be by their own wits. This has been made even clearer by the change in posture of the United States. The aggressive pressure of the Carter administration for majority rule in southern Africa together with the refusal of Congress to intervene against the Soviet Union in Angola have made it impossible for white South Africans to continue to comfort themselves with the assurance that in a pinch Uncle Sam will intervene to save white rule at the tip of Africa.

Turner gave reasons from the point of view of the Vorster government both for and against going in to shore up white rule in Mozambique. In fact South Africa tried one response with Mozambique, the opposite with Angola. Black Marxist ascendancy in Mozambique was met with a masterful calm by the Vorster government, with the result that for a time South Africa enjoyed an unprecedented "detente" with some of the black African states. But South African fear of Soviet communism is genuine, and when it seemed that in Angola there was a real possibility South African intervention might enable anti-Marxists to prevail, the Vorster government was induced to send in troops. But with Cuban troops fighting on the opposing side and the United States Congress refusing even to provide military supplies, South Africa beat an embarrassed retreat. This first invasion of the territory of a black state undercut the credibility the Vorster government had been slowly building up with the black states, escalated international pressures against South Africa, and apparently gave new courage to dissident blacks within the country. It was a costly mistake.

The Vorster government has, however, continued to find common ground with the black-ruled states of

The Eye of the Needle

southern Africa on the subject of Rhodesia, or Zimbabwe as the liberation movements call it. The South African government has played a quiet but important role in trying to persuade the Rhodesian government of Ian Smith to accept some settlement that would satisfy demands for majority rule and yet protect the investments of the white settlers. But the stubbornness of Smith, together with the distrust black leaders have of him and the inability of Zimbabwe liberation groups to get along with one another, worked against a settlement, and guerrilla fighting continued with possibilities increasing that another Angolan situation might develop there.

Why would Vorster acquiesce in undercutting the only other white-ruled country in Africa, its neighbor with whose European residents South African whites have close ties? It would be impossible to explain for anyone who maintains that South Africa is motivated primarily by ideology. Under Turner's analysis it is understandable. Vorster knows that militarily and economically Rhodesia is a drain upon South Africa rather than an asset. It appears to have been Vorster's goal to replace the row of white buffer states that once insulated South Africa from African vengeance with a cordon of semi-friendly but weak black states, including some of the South African Bantustans, tied to South Africa within a regional economic interdependency.

That hope now seems forlorn.

Another dashed hope of apartheid rule is the north-western knot on the cordon, Namibia. South Africa took the territory from Germany in World War I, administered it for the League of Nations as a mandate territory, and violated the mandate after World War II by institutionalizing apartheid and ruling the trust territory as if it were part of South Africa. Although the United Nations General Assembly in 1966 terminated the mandate, South Africa refused to admit the U.N. Council for Namibia. The Turnhalle talks, a conference promoted by the Vorster government to draft a constitution, were scrapped in 1977 with the South Africans agreeing to elections and independence for Namibia in 1978. The most widely accepted African organization, the South West Africa Peoples' Organization (SWAPO) was not present at the Turnhalle effort but, according to the proposal, will participate in the election campaign.

If the elections and United Nations supervision are undermined, the guerrilla war between SWAPO and the South African Defense Forces now being waged near the Angolan border where most of the Namibian people live will be a prelude to a long struggle.

The period since the Portuguese demise has brought sharply increasing internal tension in South Africa. A series of illegal strikes by African workers and bannings of black labor leaders has continued to point up the vulnerability of the South African economy to the disaffection of its black labor force. In 1976 African youth sparked the first widespread civil disturbances in over a decade, resulting in over four hundred deaths, most of them Africans apparently killed by police. In tough reaction, the government brought criminal charges against 4,200 persons and escalated the rate of detentions under no-trial security laws. Black opposition groups had begun emerging into the open for the first time since the severe repression of the early sixties.

With sporadic demonstrations continuing in the urban townships, seventeen of these organizations were summarily outlawed in October of 1977 and virtually all their leaders put under indefinite detention. The only major newspaper catering to an African readership was closed down and its editor imprisoned. A prominent white editor who had spoken out on behalf of the blacks was banned. The interracial Christian Institute, original publisher of *The Eye of the Needle*, was outlawed, its property confiscated, and its internationally respected leaders banned.

The astute realism with which the Vorster government has accepted black rule in Mozambique and the possibility of it in Rhodesia and Namibia, together with its expressed willingness to concede to Coloureds

The Eye of the Needle

and Indians a larger measure of self-government through far-reaching constitutional changes, contrasts sharply with the government's harsh repression of African aspirations within South Africa. What this demonstrates is that white survival, not race theory, is the dominating principle of Afrikaner leadership. Its fear of Soviet-Cuban presence in Angola and its suspicion that all internal unrest is traceable to communist infiltration show that the Vorster government agrees with Richard Turner's basic thesis, that white privilege in South Africa is inseparably linked to an economic system.

January 1978

To speak as Richard Turner has spoken is to make enemies. One of those enemies has now brutally killed Richard Turner. Thus the U.S. edition of *The Eye of the Needle* which Rick Turner had waited so eagerly to see becomes his memorial. We take courage from the knowledge that it will continue to argue Rick's message of brotherhood and justice.

Merrill Proudfoot, *Park College*

Ronald Christenson, *Gustavus Adolphus College*

1. THE NECESSITY OF UTOPIAN THINKING

By Richard Turner

The Eye of the Needle

There are two kinds of "impossibility": the absolute impossibility and the "other things being equal" impossibility. It is absolutely impossible to teach a lion to become a vegetarian. "Other things being equal" it is impossible for a black person to become prime minister of South Africa.

"Given that the whites are in power in South Africa and that they will continue to want what they want now, it is impossible to have a just society in South Africa. So let us try to see what changes they can be persuaded to accept within that context. Can we perhaps persuade them at least to eat old goats instead of our prize lambs?" This has been the typical approach of South African liberal groups in general. We need to go beyond this. We need to ask whether in fact white South Africans are absolutely and inevitably carnivorous. Let us, for once, stop asking what the whites can be persuaded to do, what concessions, other things being equal, they may make, and instead explore the absolute limits of possibility by sketching an ideally just society.

There are two reasons why it is important to think in long-range "Utopian" terms. Christianity does not just condemn racism. It constitutes a challenge to all accepted values, an invitation to continuous self-examination, to a continuous attempt at transcendence. We need therefore to explore, and, if necessary, to attack, all the implicit assumptions about how to behave toward other people that underlie our daily actions in all spheres.

We may find that Christianity is incompatible not only with racism but also with many of the other norms regulating our behavior, and that in order to live in a Christian way we will need radically to restructure our society. For what is a society? We sometimes tend to speak and think of a society and of social institutions as though they were natural entities, part of the geography of the world in which we live. The geography of an area determines, with fair rigidity, the possibilities of movement open to us; we can go around a mountain, or over it, but not through it—although in a pinch we could build a tunnel through a small part of it. But we would never even dream of moving the whole mountain. Similarly, we tend to see the institutions of our society—the type of economic structure, the family, the school system, the existence of nation states, the polity, and so on—as natural entities imposing certain rigidities on our behavior. We see our area of choice in interpersonal relations as being marked out by these institutions. We can pay our employees slightly higher or lower wages, but we cannot do without a wage system. We might try three successive monogamous marriages, but we wouldn't consider polyandry. We may even tinker slightly, building a tunnel here and a bridge there, by simplifying divorce laws or legislating against trade unions. But the great core institutions remain essentially unaltered and unalterable.

However, a social institution is certainly not a solid existing thing like a mountain or an ocean. It may have certain material substrata—written rules and regulations, or a school building to house it in—but ultimately an institution is nothing but a set of behavior patterns. It is the way in which people behave toward one another. Private property as an institution is a particular way of using material things in relations with other people. If, for example, everybody took down their fences and stopped keeping people off "their" pieces of land, we would have different property institutions. That is, if everybody behaved differently, the environmental geography would remain the same, but the social geography would change.

Now this is, of course, once it has been stated, monumentally obvious. Why, then, do people continue to take for granted the fixity of social institutions, and in so doing continue to act out the behavior patterns that collectively keep the institutions in being? The most obvious reason is that simply my behaving in a particular way does not create an institution; everybody behaving in the same way creates it. So to change it, it is necessary for everybody, or at least nearly everybody, to change their behavior. If I give away my property I do not thereby abolish private property as an institution; I only abolish my private property.

But there may be other reasons as well. First, it may be that we cannot in fact behave differently. It may be that, in some spheres at least, we can behave only in certain ways: e.g., that polyandry is impossible because

The Eye of the Needle

men are naturally jealous and possessive, that private property is based on a biological drive to ownership, and so on. Factors such as these I shall refer to as "imperatives of human nature." Secondly, it may be that, in order for the coordinated action of a large number of people to be effective, certain behavior patterns have to be ruled out. For example, it may be that when more than a certain number of people are involved, group decision-making becomes impossible, so that some sort of decision-making hierarchy is required. Imperatives of this sort I shall refer to as "imperatives of organization."

In order to reflect on our values, then, we have to see which aspects of our society is the necessary result of the imperatives of human nature and of organization, and which aspects of it are changeable. We then need to make explicit the value principles embodied in our actual behavior, and to criticize these principles in the light of other possible values. Until we realize what other values, and what other social forms, are possible, we cannot judge the morality or otherwise of the existing society.

This brings me to the second reason for the importance of Utopian thinking. Unless we can see our society in the light of other possible societies we cannot even understand how and why it works as it does, let alone judge it. Let us take the example of thinking about race. It is "common sense" (to white South Africans) that black people are inferior to white people. And this common sense is not just some sort of delusion. It is based on white South Africans' experience of the objective "inferiority" of most blacks in, for example, education, income, dress and language proficiency (that is, proficiency in the only languages that whites recognize). And, moreover, nearly everyone they know treats blacks as inferior. They see black "inferiority" as one of the imperatives of human nature. They "explain" a social fact by direct reference to biology and thereby misunderstand it. If we assume the natural inferiority of a group we don't look for social causes of its actual "inferiority." If, on the other hand, we discover that there is no biological root for this "inferiority," no imperative of human nature, then we begin to ask the illuminating question: What is the social structure that creates the various objective "inferiorities" of certain groups? And only then do we understand how our society operates.

Common-sense thinking obscures reality. The example of thinking about race is obvious, but perhaps an unfortunate example just because it is so obvious. For in most cases, almost by definition, the fallacies of common-sense thinking are not obvious. The struggle of the women's liberation movement to be taken seriously, let alone to attain its goals, is an example of this. It is "common sense" that women look after children, expect their husbands to have more interesting jobs than they can have, leave discussion on important issues such as politics and business to men, play only a secondary role in public affairs—typing and envelope-licking, rather than speaking, planning, and organizing. Above all, they look "attractive" and do the cooking. They do tend to do all these things, and perhaps are even satisfied doing only these things. Yet there is no biological reason why women should make the coffee while men talk. With the invention of sterilized bottles and powdered milk, there is not even any reason why they should stay at home and mind the children. A man can make a bottle and change a diaper.

This perspective opens up important theoretical and ethical questions:

1. What are the historical reasons that women have assumed their present roles, and what are the social mechanisms used to impose the role on each woman as she grows up? How does the girl baby, the potentially free creative human being, get trained to be a contented dishwasher?
2. If a woman's role is to make coffee, then morality consists in giving her enough money to buy the coffee and asking her nicely when you want it done. If, however, a woman could play other roles, then the man has to rethink his role, has to rethink what man-woman relations mean. The man and woman together have to create a new set of values.

The Eye of the Needle

So unless we think in a "Utopian" way about the position of women in society we miss two important sets of problems: (1) Why does society work in the way it does?

(2) Is there any moral justification for the ethical imperatives that regulate man-woman behavior? How should men and women relate to one another, and what social institutions should we strive for in which to embody these relationships?

Similarly, unless we think in Utopian terms about South African society we will not really come to understand how it works today. We will take for granted in equalities, power relationships, and behavior patterns that need to be explained. Nor will we be able to evaluate the society adequately. We will not understand on how many different levels there are alternatives, and so the possibility of choice, and so the possibility of moral judgement.

To understand a society, to understand what it is, where it is going, and where it could go, we cannot just describe it. We need also to theorize about it. We need to refer back and forth between what we see in the society and what is essential to any society. When we look at a car we can distinguish easily between the chrome and that in the car which is essential to its functioning. This is an example of simple theorizing, to be able to do the same thing about society. Theory itself is not difficult. What is often difficult is to shift oneself into a theoretical attitude, that is, to things in one's experience cannot be taken for granted. In the case of cars the problem is simplified by more difficult. First, most people experience only one society in depth. Second, a society changes relatively slowly. The present nearly always seems to be at least fairly permanent. In order to theorize about society perhaps the first step (psychologically) we have to make is to grasp the present as history. History is not something that has just come to end and certainly not something that came to an end fifty years ago. Societies, including our own society, have been changing in many ways, great and small, throughout time, and there is no reason to believe that they have stopped now. History is not a process leading up to perfection in the flowering of our present "civilization"—which is the ordinary unreflecting attitude to it. There is still so much that is irrational in human behavior that, even if we see the progress of "civilization" as a linear upward march, it is unlikely to stop here. And if we don't see it this way it is even less likely to stop here!

So it is probable that many of our social institutions and personal ways of behaving will change. The fact that something exists is no guarantee that it will continue to exist or that it should exist. A glance at some of the institutions that other societies have taken unquestioningly for granted—cannibalism, slavery, polygamy, communal property ownership, non-competitiveness, nudity, vegetarianism, male supremacy, matriarchy, promiscuity, Puritanism, the rule of divine emperors or the rule of hereditary aristocracies, and even, on occasion, democracy—should make us a little more hesitant in taking absolutely for granted such institutions as private ownership of the means of production, social inequality, monogamy, the school system, "national growth," war, and racial oligarchy in South Africa.

2. HUMAN MODELS: CHRISTIANITY AND CAPITALISM

Our first step in theorizing must be to examine briefly the "imperatives of human nature" and the "imperatives of organization."

The concept "human nature" plays a very important role in our "common sense" thinking. We often explain difficult phenomena, such as war, corruption, and jealousy, as being products of "human nature." And the

The Eye of the Needle

idea that there is a fixed human nature is reinforced by a glance at the other people in our social milieu. They all seem to want much the same thing, to behave in the same way, to expect the same sorts of things out of life and out of their relations with other people. But a slightly wider glance, as we have already seen, shows that from society to society what people want and do varies enormously. Perhaps the only uniformity is that each group believes that the way it behaves is normal "human nature," and that other groups that behave differently are perverted or wicked or, at the very least, "barbarous and uncivilized"!

Besides this empirical reason for rejecting the idea that there is any closely defined human nature, there is also a good theoretical reason for doing so. Human beings can choose. They are not sucked into the future by stimuli to which they have to respond in specific ways. Rather, human beings are continually making choices. They can stand back and look at alternatives. Theoretically, they can choose about anything. They can choose whether to live or to die; they can choose celibacy or promiscuity, voluntary poverty or the pursuit of wealth, ice-cream or jelly. Obviously they can't always get what they choose, but that is a different question.

We have, then, three problems: First, why is it that, in spite of the wide range of possible choices and possible modes of fulfillment available, most people in each particular group tend to choose the same things and have the same values? I shall refer to the set of values and behavior patterns that characterize any particular group or individual as a "human model." How do human models get actualized? Second, what is the relation between the human model or models characteristic of a particular society and the overall social structure? Third, how do we evaluate human models? To understand how our society works we have to be able to answer these questions.

Most people make choices within a very narrow context, defined by a set of implicit and explicit values that they do not realize can themselves be chosen or rejected. How do they get these values? People are born into a pre-existing society and into a pre-existing niche within that society. From the moment of my birth I am trained in many formal and informal, direct and indirect ways, to accept a particular human model. I am "socialized."

The family socializes me first, of course. By the use of rewards, punishment, and example, the family teaches me where and when not to make a noise, what pleasures are permitted and what are forbidden, how a female or a male is expected to behave in my society. I also learn the social structure through the roles I observe the members of my family playing in it. I learn what to expect and what not to expect. I learn a language in which are embedded a whole set of social values.

Outside my family, I am socialized by an education system. This operates in two ways. The style of education and, in particular, the form of discipline get me used to certain types of relationships with other people, for example, deference to authority figures, bureaucratic order as a mode of life, etc. The style will also embody a style of thinking. The content of the education also tells me how society works, what is "good" and what is "bad," etc.

Finally, I am subjected to fact and fiction in the information media of the society. The "facts" are inevitably selected facts, selected by people who have already gone through the socialization process and so selecting using the socially accepted criteria. The fiction provides behavior models and values. In "civilized" societies advertising projects a picture of what is desirable and what is not, of what successful people do and of what makes for failure. In "barbarous" societies, poetry, song, and drama perform a similar function.

In one way, socialization is a necessary and desirable process. For any society to exist, children have to learn at least two things. They have to learn to accord at least some rights to other people. No society can exist without this, and it is probable that the poorer the society the greater will have to be this internal repression

The Eye of the Needle

of the drive toward one's own pleasure. Second, they have to learn the rules for communicating with other people—the logic and the language and all the ways of behaving which go with the language to make it a living means of communication. The child who consistently laughs when burnt would have serious problems in our society.

But, beyond this, socialization does more. It prepares individuals not just for social living, but also for living out specific roles in a specific social structure. The social structure may be one of gross inequality, but if the socializing mechanisms are working effectively, independent, kicking children can be turned into passive accepting adults at the bottom of the pile, who accept their role because they have been deprived of the capacity to conceive of any other way of existing. The effect of the process of socialization is to make a particular social structure and a particular human model seem to be natural, and to hide the fact that it is not natural and could be changed.

The process of socialization can narrow down the individual's range of perceptions and choices to a pre defined social reality. One particular human model becomes "human nature."

Socialization can induce acceptance of inequality by the oppressed group in an unequal social structure. They can come to believe in their own inferiority and in the natural rights of their oppressors and exploiters. This is not necessarily something brought about by the Machiavellian cunning of the dominant group. Once a social structure is in existence, mechanisms take over that tend to keep it going. The dominant groups are also being socialized. They are being socialized into dominant roles, with the concomitant belief in the naturalness of their dominance, of their superiority, whether it is race superiority in South Africa, caste superiority in classical India, or the superior virtues and intelligence of the middle-classes in nineteenth-century Europe. The system seems to perpetuate itself, and in one sense at least each group is as much a victim of the system as is any other. Each individual's human potential is reduced to a cardboard role whether it is as male or as female, as oppressed or as oppressor.

In South Africa, whites as well as blacks are victims of the social structure. They are, of course, victims of a different kind: The bulk of the whites are responsible victims, who exercise coercive power to keep the structure in existence. But to forget that they are also victims would be to accept their own value-system, to accept that to be like a white South African—rich, greedy, and frightened of one's fellows—is the ideal way for humans to be.

We need now to look more closely at the human model characteristic of our own particular society. There are three problems here. The first is that, as in any society split into groups playing different roles, there must be a different model for each group if each is to play its different role effectively. If they are not to revolt, the poor must have expectations different from the rich.

The second is that, in South Africa, we have a number of different cultures that have been brought together in a specific way by conquest (including the British conquest of India) and have not as yet been welded into a completely complementary set of roles.

The third is the important role that the concept "race" plays in the thinking of all groups. Most whites identify their "superiority" and their "right to dominance" in race terms.

I shall for the moment ignore these three complicating factors. To understand and evaluate our society it is most important to analyze the human model of the dominant group, which of itself tells us something about the others. The cultural diversity is being broken down by the process of industrialization and urbanization, which is replacing a logically unconnected set of cultures by an interdependent and coherent set of cultures with certain common elements derived from the culture of the dominant group. Finally, race as a sign of

The Eye of the Needle

superiority inferiority is of secondary importance to the concept of superiority-inferiority. In ethics, the principle that it is all right to push some people around is logically prior to the decision as to precisely who will be so pushed around. The question "Can I exploit?" is prior to the question "Whom can I exploit?"

South Africa is a capitalist society, and the human model characteristic of the dominant white group in South Africa is the capitalist human model. I shall therefore discuss here the values underlying the capitalist social system. A value system contains two elements: (1) ideas about the ways in which it is natural for human beings to find their personal satisfaction;

(2) ideas about how human beings ought to treat one another. We often tend to take (1) for granted, and to confine arguments about values to (2). But there are different possible ways of finding personal satisfaction: a high level of material consumption, loving God, achieving Satori, communicating with one's fellows, developing one's intellect, serving the glory of one's nation, perfecting one's body, or climbing Mount Everest. And the terms of the argument about how to treat others will be set by how we decide to treat ourselves.

The values imposed by the socialization process in capitalist societies are those which that particular form of society needs in order to survive.

The following are the essential elements of capitalist society:

1. Some people control the means of production. The rest of the population, having no tools or land of their own, has no option but to work for those who do own the tools or the land. And the owners naturally expect to get something out of permitting them to do so. The basis on which they are employed is that some of the products of their labor should be given to the capitalists in return for the "right" to use the capitalists' means of production. To put it another way, the workers receive wages that are less than the value of their labor. The capitalists accumulate capital by taking the surplus product, which they have not worked to produce. This is exploitation.

The fact of private ownership of the means of production is not essentially affected by shareownership replacing individual ownership. Probably in no capitalist country do more than 5 percent of the population own a significant number of shares.

The fact of exploitation is not minimized or refuted by a rising standard of living. To say that the workers are exploited is not necessarily to say that they are impoverished. It is to say that, whatever they are earning, they are also creating new capital for the capitalists, capital which, once they have created it, is not only not theirs but is the very instrument which the capitalist use to keep the workers under their control. Production is the result of the cooperation of a large number of people working together, but the end result is private ownership by one person. Cooperative, social production produces individual, monopoly ownership.

Arguing that the capitalists play a role in the production process does not refute the fact of exploitation. They may also act as managers, in which case they are productive and deserve some reward. But in fact their major reward comes from the fact that they own or control capital. Although capital—that is, machinery, raw material, etc.—can be used productively, owning or controlling capital is not a productive activity. It merely places one in a position to tax the real producers.

The fact of exploitation is not refuted by arguing that the capitalists are benefiting from their past hard work and their past savings. Most fortunes are just not made that way. They are based on inherited wealth, often going back to colonial plunder, land ownership based on conquest of the English by the Normans, the red Indians by the white Americans, the blacks by the whites. They are based on financial skill bearing little or no

The Eye of the Needle

relationship to production. They are based often on corruption. They are based, essentially, on being at the right place at the right time, that is, on being able to place oneself, perhaps, but not necessarily, by hard work, at some bottleneck in the social production process from which one can draw off wealth. Cecil John Rhodes was not just a hard-working miner. He was a financier and a corrupt politician. Even if the original capital is created honestly by hard work and saving, once it is used to employ other people it continues to expand by exploitation.

2. The capitalists' objective in exploiting workers is not, as might be expected, simply their own personal good, in terms of a comfortable life and a high level of consumption.

If it were, they would, once they had made their first million, retire, relax, and enjoy themselves. But they do not. They ruin their health competing for a level of wealth that they could not possibly consume, even if they wanted to. Accumulation, from being a means to the end of a comfortable life, has become an end in itself. The business has become an independent entity that uses the owner to help it grow. This is the sense in which the capitalists themselves are victims of the situation, blinded to what they are doing and to why they are doing it, and deprived of the awareness of other modes of satisfying themselves. The social system becomes an independent thing and people become subject to it.

3. At an advanced level of accumulation, the need for markets as an outlet for the products of all this accumulated capital becomes important. It therefore becomes necessary to boost the consumption of that sector of the population that has surplus cash. They have to be forced to consume the product, whether they "want" to or not. And the easiest way to do this is to make them believe that they do really want to consume and to do nothing but consume. This is the role played by advertising. Each advertisement projects both a style of life based on consumption and the desirability of adding a particular product to the list of what it is necessary to consume. Popular fiction and popular magazines join in selling this same lifestyle. In a very real sense individuals are not free to choose whether to consume or not. There are so many forces working on them, from the Joneses to the TV set to the color supplement of the Sunday paper, that they are not aware of any alternative mode of living.

The social system has socialized them to suit its needs. People consume what it needs them to consume. Production is based not on the freely expressed needs of the individuals, but on the "needs" of the producing firms to maximize a certain type of profit-oriented growth.

This forced consumption can occur among certain social groups at the same time as other social groups are being forced to restrict consumption by being paid low wages so that their employers can accumulate more. South Africa is an obvious example of this, but it probably applies to all capitalist countries to a greater or lesser extent. It is worth pointing out that this is bound to have a destabilizing effect on society because the poor are to at least some extent subject to the same socializing pressures that are stressing to the "middle-classes" the absolute necessity of consuming more.

The value system underlying a capitalist society contains three crucial elements:

(1) *An attitude to work;*

(2) *An attitude to the consumption of material goods;*

(3) *An attitude to other people.*

In this society, acquisition, ownership, and consumption of material goods is the greatest aim of human beings. Work is only a means to this. It is not something an individual does because of the inherent

The Eye of the Needle

meaningfulness of creative activity. It is an unpleasant necessity to be got over as soon as possible so that you can go home and consume. Any useful by-products, such as companionship at the work place, do not essentially mitigate the unpleasantness of work; one would much prefer to do something else companionably. In this process other people are something to be used to help in getting things. The worker is a means for the capitalist's end of accumulating. This means that work is often objectively as unpleasant as it is described to be. The capitalist employs the worker for an objective other than the worker's own satisfaction, so the nature of the work and the work environment are designed for that other purpose. They are designed to maximize profit, not to give the worker satisfaction from a meaningful task.

This fact is not contradicted by the introduction of "human relations" and "personnel management" into industry. The discovery that in some situations relatively satisfied workers are more stable and productive than disgruntled workers does not mean that workers' satisfaction replaces profit as the motive. Personnel management merely involves oiling the workers, just as one oils the machinery. The workers remain means to another person's end—perhaps a slightly more comfortable means, but still essentially one being manipulated more effectively away from the possibility of discovering just what is happening to them. It refines the process of controls placed on the workers and persuades them to cooperate more willingly in their own exploitation.

To the extent that some workers, particularly at the executive level, do find their work meaningful and satisfying, it is because (a) they have available to them a wide range of choices of action that, by definition in such a system, cannot be available to the mass of workers, and (b) because they have unquestioningly accepted the business's own definition of its importance. To be an enthusiastic and satisfied deodorant executive you have to believe in the importance of economic growth in general and of deodorants in particular. And to believe that you have to have been through a pretty heavy conditioning process.

It is important to stress that there are two major components in the value system of capitalism. The justification of exploitation and manipulation as a way of relating to other people is based upon the prior assumption that human beings fulfil themselves by owning, accumulating, or consuming material goods. Because the individuals' own goals of fulfilment give priority to goods rather than to people, they are justified in exploiting people to achieve that goal.

Relations with other people are not sought as ends in themselves, but as means to other ends. People use other people, rather than love other people. Each tries to manipulate the other, using force or Dale Carnegie. Instead of communicating, sharing experiences with others, individuals either buy others, or sell themselves to others. The commercial practice influences the private practice. If people are their own commodities they have to act to preserve and increase their market values. They must do this in the same way as is done in the case of other goods—by advertising techniques and "finish." In this situation they cannot afford to be open or honest with one another, for to be honest is to risk the other gaining an advantage. The result of playing roles with other people is that people end up playing roles with themselves. When people have identified themselves with particular roles, they can no longer see themselves as ongoing beings, able to learn, to develop, and to change. Criticism, instead of being an invitation to self-examination and growth, becomes a simple threat—a threat to habit and a threat to commodity value. The reaction is to discount criticism and to cling to the "finality" of one's present being.

Finally, the process of separation from other people reinforces the socialization process by stopping people from thinking about themselves, and so stopping them from realizing that they could be other than they have been socialized to be. But the refusal to change, the refusal of openness, and the necessity for continuous self-defence wreak the psychological havoc of fear, tension, and half-suppressed insecurity.

Some capitalists may read these lines, and it is possible that they will not recognize themselves in what I

The Eye of the Needle

have written. After all, even capitalists sometimes love their wives, enjoy the sunshine, and help old ladies across the road. But I am not attempting to deny this. It is necessary to distinguish between the nature of a social structure and the way in which individuals operate within the structure. I may smile at my secretary, donate money to the factory sports club, take an interest in welfare work, and belong to the Progressive Party, and yet still exploit my workers and fit the description made above. Exploitation is not a function of the good or ill will of the particular capitalist. It is a structural relation between capitalist and worker. And precisely because it is a structural relation the capitalists (and often the workers too) take it for granted and so do not realize that they are responsible for it. And it is the structural relationship that places limitations on human community.

In the light of this concept of structural relations, we can see that there are two kinds of ethical systems. One accepts the predominant human model and tries to rationalize it, to smooth the edges. I shall call this an internal morality: Pay your debts, give to the poor, don't tell lies, don't steal (i.e., don't deprive people of property that is theirs in terms of the given legal-property system in ways that the system does not permit). In a slave society, feed your slaves properly; don't sell their children until they are eight years old. In war, kill people with bullets, but not with poison gas.

These internal moralities make life slightly easier for people within the system, and as such should not be sneered at. But they do not challenge the human model implicit in the system. An ethic which does this I shall refer to as a *transcendent morality*. It goes beyond the given and asks the fundamental question: "What is human life for, what is the meaning of human life?"

When asking what sort of society is compatible with Christianity, we have first to ask whether Christianity embodies an internal morality or a transcendent morality. And the answer is obvious.

The essence of all religions lies in the concept of *transcendence*, that is, in the idea of something (whether it be a "reality" or an "ideal") which goes beyond the present, which goes beyond what people are doing in the world at this moment, and in the light of which the present is only of secondary importance. Religion challenges the commonsense tendency to be committed to the present, to see the world as we experience it now as the only possible form of reality. This challenge occurs on two interrelated levels: in terms of a *transcendent reality* (God) and in terms of a *transcendent ethic*. The latent role of the affirmation of a transcendent reality is to challenge the natural arrogance whereby individuals believe that their particular way of seeing the world is the only possible way of seeing it. Rather, the world always goes beyond what they know of it, always slips out of any attempt at a final and adequate description. Human beings are always limited to partial perspectives on the world. On the practical level this implies that no particular way of behaving can ever be final. The *transcendent ethic* demands that we question our taken-for-granted ways of behaving, that we must *continually* question them.

No great religious leader has said: "Change your beliefs, but continue to act in the way in which you have always acted." Each leader has attacked both old social forms and old religious forms. They have attacked religious forms that have precisely lost their transcendence and become merely repetitive rituals. They have attacked social forms that have become unquestioned, hence mechanical and non-human, and unjust, hence dehumanizing.

We have seen the Hebrew prophets attacking the worship of the Golden Calf—both an idol with a ritual attached, and a way of life in which personal material satisfaction turns one away from one's neighbor. We have seen Christ breaking the Sabbath to cure the sick—so showing that the mechanical ritual of Sabbath observance must give way to an intelligent understanding of the transcendent significance of the Sabbath as a day in which I cease from my own selfish pursuits and consider the needs of the whole, and hence of other men and women. We have seen Muhammad challenging the ways of the wealthy merchants of Mecca, who

The Eye of the Needle

believed that their wealth gave them power over both people and gods, by asserting the universality of the one God, who cannot be bought, and by asserting that wealth must be used for social purposes, not for individual purposes.

Beware! You do not honor the orphan,

Nor urge to feed the poor,

Greedily you devour the inheritance of the weak,

And you love riches inordinately.

(Koran: LXXXIX 18-20)

The history of religious decay and reform is the history of the gradual decline of these transcendent beliefs and practices into the given, a decline whereby they become nothing more than a "traditional way of life" in which religious observance is mere ritual and in which the transcendent ethic gets moulded into the very untranscendent social structure and becomes an "opiate to the people"—until a new reformer shatters the structure, either by creating a new religion (Muhammad), or by appealing to the pristine transcendence of an earlier religious genius (Calvin).

The social relevance of religion, then, lies in the fact that it commands us to question accepted human models and the accepted social structure in which they are embodied.

Christianity is no exception to this rule. Even if we see Christianity as essentially "otherworldly," then it is at least a negative rejection of all those value systems that consider anything in this world important. But Christianity is not an "other worldly" religion. The very doctrine of the incarnation of God in this world expresses the central importance of this world and of human history for Christianity. "God is not the God of the dead, but of the living" (Matt. 22:32). The ethical precepts of both Old and New Testaments direct us toward other people, not away from them and into the other world.

"Love your neighbor as yourself." Who is my neighbor? Who am I? What is "love"? All people are my neighbors. When I act I must take into account all people who could be affected, either by commission or by omission as a result of my act, just as I take into consideration how I will be affected by it. This is a political injunction as well as a moral one, since it commands that I should understand the social structure of my society, the way in which my acts and others' acts are interrelated.

The question "Who am I?" and the question "What is love?" are interdependent, and the answer to these two questions shows that, for Christianity, to love my neighbor is part of the definition of being human. That is, I am not told, and "love your neighbor" as I might be told eat an apple a day." It is not something external to me some accidental order that I might or might not carry out without affecting my very nature.

The answer to the question "What am I?" involves the stating of a human model. A complete statement of what I am includes a reference to my future, to what I should be. For Christianity, what I should be is defined by the example of Jesus Christ. Theologian Paul van Buren has written:

His characteristics seem to have impressed his followers so that he stands out as a remarkably free man in the records of remembered parable, saying, or incident, and in the way in which the early Christian community spoke of him.... [The Evangelists] speak, for example, of his "authority," or they point to his openness to friend and foe. Although he is presented as a faithful son of his parents, he is also shown to be free from

The Eye of the Needle

familial claims. He followed the religious rites and observances of his people, but he also felt free to disrepair them.... He did not rest the authority of his teaching on tradition.... When enemies questioned or friends suggested basis for his authority, he evaded them. He simply spoke and acted with the authority of a singular freedom.... He called his hearers to be without anxiety for the future concerning clothes, food, or shelter, and he supported his words with his own conduct.... He seems to have been so free of any need to status that he was able to resist all attempts by others to convey status on him (The Secular Meaning of the Gospel [New York: Macmillan, 1963], pp. 121-23).

Through the various specific incidents and parables what shines out is Jesus' freedom: his ability to be open to other people and to react to them and their needs, not in terms of preconceived, stereotyped ideas and attitudes, but afresh in each new situation. To be able to love other persons is to be able to communicate with them, to be open to their way of seeing the world. It is to go directly to the person, rather than to the role or stereotype. And to be able to do this I must myself be free. I must have escaped from the stereotyped attitudes and behavior patterns imposed by my background and socialization. This I can do only through self-awareness, self-analysis, and self-criticism. To love the other I must lay myself open. And it is in laying myself open to the other in this way in loving communication that I become self-aware and free. The development of my reason and of self-consciousness can only occur in interaction with other people, in community. Love your neighbor as yourself. This means, very literally, that to be yourself you must love your neighbor. Community is a good in itself and not a way of attaining other goods. It is the basic mode of human fulfillment.

Already it must be clear how different the Christian human model is from the capitalist model. "It is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle than for a rich man to enter into the kingdom of God" (Matt. 19:24). If I concentrate on things, rather than people, I become a slave. I become dependent on things. I behave in the way in which the things need me to behave. In each relationship with the other I am not free to be open to the other as a person. I have to manipulate the other in such a way as to obtain things. And to manipulate the other I have to manipulate myself. This is my essential degradation, for in manipulating myself I finally lose my freedom. I become identified with the role I am playing. My punishment, exclusion from the kingdom of heaven, is not external to my sin. It is the internal consequence of my preference of things to people.

3. SOUTH AFRICA: CULTURE AND CONFLICT

South Africa, everyone agrees, is a profoundly unequal society. It is marked by inequality of power, of wealth, of access to the means for acquiring power and/or wealth, of education, and of status. This much is agreed upon. Disagreement arises, however, when the causes of this situation are sought. Most whites see these inequalities as being the result of the unequal contribution made by the various ethnic groups. The whites have "brought civilization, developed industry, etc., and it is only natural that they should take the lion's share. The blacks have not really contributed, either because they are biologically inferior, or because

The Eye of the Needle

they are culturally inferior. There is disagreement as to whether and when this cultural gap can be bridged, but there is wide agreement that it existed in the first place and is at the origin of today's inequalities. Most blacks, on the other hand, see these inequalities as being largely the result of exploitation and of inequality of opportunity.

The structure of South African society today is a function of its past. To understand the society and its conflicts, and, more important, to understand how it is likely to develop and how these conflicts may be resolved, it is necessary to look back to see which of these different accounts of the origins of inequality is more accurate.

What happened when Europeans first arrived in South Africa and slowly began to occupy it? What kind of relations did they try to enter into with the indigenous peoples? Did they try to cooperate on an equal basis with these people and to give them the benefit of whatever technological superiority they might have had? And if not, why not?

In 1652 South Africa was inhabited from the Cape to the Limpopo by self-governing peoples. It was not logically impossible for Europeans to have requested the right to immigrate, subject to the laws of the local people, and to have offered, in return, to share their technical skills with the inhabitants. This, after all, is the type of implicit agreement made by immigrants today, whether they are British artisans going to Australia or Indian doctors going to Britain. Did anything like this happen in 1652 or afterwards, and if not, why not?

The first question is easy to answer: Very obviously, it did not. The whole history of relations between foreigners and natives in South Africa can be summed up by the following quotation from Van Riebeeck's diary:

the reasons advanced by them [the Hottentots] for ... making war upon us last year, arising out of the complaints... that our people, living at a distance, and without our knowledge, had done them much injury, and also perhaps stolen and eaten up some of their sheep and calves etc. in which there is also some truth, and which it is very difficult to keep the common people from doing, when a little out of sight; so that they think they had cause for revenge, and especially, they said, upon people who had come to take and to occupy the land which had been their own in all ages, turning with the plough and cultivating permanently their best land, and keeping them off the ground upon which they had been accustomed to pasture their cattle, so that they must consequently now seek their subsistence by depasturing the land of other people, from which nothing could arise but disputes with their neighbors; insisting so strenuously upon the point of restoring to them their own land, that we were at length compelled to say they had entirely forfeited that right, through the war which they had waged against us, and that we were not inclined to restore it, as it had now become the property of the Company by the sword and the laws of war (Oxford History of South Africa [New York: Oxford University Press, 1969], p. 65).

Occupation of land by the whites, resulting in pressure on the land resources of the local people, conflict between the local tribes, war, and white victory, followed by a "lack of inclination" to return the land: That is the history of South Africa.

Although the question is so easy to answer, it is nevertheless vitally important to ask it. Otherwise, we fall into the trap of seeing the whole process of conquest as being as inevitable as a lava flow, as being the

The Eye of the Needle

"natural" relationship between two groups.

In a sense, it was inevitable. But it was not inevitable because it is "natural" for people to behave in the way that the Europeans behaved in South Africa. It was inevitable because the culture that they possessed made it impossible for them to conceive of any other way of behaving.

The word "civilization" has long bedevilled rational thought about relationships between Europe and Africa. The polarization of the issue into a civilized - uncivilized dichotomy has prevented a clear analysis of the similarities and differences between African and European culture. Furthermore, by describing European culture as "civilization" one unconsciously tends to see it as unchanging, as final. One takes the greatest cultural achievements and the loftiest sentiments of the age and then tends to assume that everybody in the period was involved in those achievements and practiced that ethic.

But clearly the culture of seventeenth-century Europe was very different from what it is today. And, equally clearly, the great cultural figures of that and earlier times—Locke, Newton, Milton, Spinoza, etc. — were not exactly typical. Most European countries were autocracies, ruled by hereditary monarchs. Others, like England, were ruled by oligarchies: small groups of the wealthy, who were often corrupt and always ruled in their own interests. It was simply taken for granted that the mass of the people had no political rights. The culture was riddled with superstition. Even a famous philosopher like John Locke believed that you should collect medicinal herbs only at the astrologically correct time. Belief in witchcraft was endemic, and it is probable that witch doctors, that is, experts in counteracting witchcraft, were "at least as numerous and as influential as the regular clergy" (L. Stone, "The Disenchantment of the World," *New York Review of Books*, December 2, 1971, p. 18).

In the field of law and punishment, as Monica Wilson has written, "in the 18th Century, when the gibbet, the wheel, and the rack were still publicly displayed at the Cape and flogging with up to 100 lashes was a regular punishment for soldiers and sailors, the rule of the chief was mild in comparison" (*Oxford History of South Africa*). Slavery was an accepted feature of society. Domestic slavery in Europe itself was only just dying out, and the slave trade as a vital part of economic life was already under way. Slavery was accepted by nearly all, if not all, Christian denominations, as was social and political inequality.

The essential change that had come about in Europe was in the economy. The static, subsistence economy of the Middle Ages, in which money played little part, and in which wealth was largely for use rather than for accumulation and reinvestment, was giving way to a growth - an accumulation-oriented money economy. In Europe, the growth of this economy meant that the network of personal relations, rights, and duties between serf and lord was being replaced by the impersonal relations of the market, in which workers became merely instruments of production, toward whom the employers had no more duties than toward the machines. In the relation between Europe and the rest of the world, this economic change was both cause and result of imperialism. The period of European expansion had begun. Backed by the self-righteousness of their assumed Christian superiority, Europeans were moving from a trading relationship to a conquering relationship with the rest of the world. This was made possible by a sudden burst of technological advance which, for the first time in the million years of human life, was giving Europe a very definite technological and hence also military lead over the rest of the world.

Although the basis for imperialism lay in superior military power, the Christian churches played a vital supporting role.

The right to conquer was often formulated in terms of religion: Christians were God's chosen people; as such they were culturally superior to all other people and also had rights that others did not have. The churches fully backed this. It was, after all, a pope who divided the already inhabited western hemisphere between

The Eye of the Needle

Spain and Portugal.

Usually, when envisaging the 1652 settlers, we mentally take farmers off their tractors, or clerks out of their offices, dress them up in funny clothes, and place them on funny little ships in Table Bay. But these settlers were not modern people in funny clothes. Their cultural background was the Europe we have just described; a culture which, on the one hand, although beginning to develop a rational technology, was still basically superstitious and pre-scientific, and, on the other hand, was characterized by an acceptance of gross inequality between person and person, by callous indifference to human suffering, and by the acceptance of the right of one person to exploit another.

It was this culture, which made it "impossible" for them to act other than as they did. To condemn them for it would be anachronistic. It is pointless passing ethical judgment on the people of one period using the standards of another period. But to feel offended at the realization that one's ancestors were like this would be even sillier than to pass judgment on them. The point is that early white settlers in this country were not markedly culturally superior to the other inhabitants. They had links with the technological growth point of the modern world, some of them were literate, and they were Christians. But even their Christianity was far removed from the "rational" Christianity of today and was tied up in the superstitions of the pre-scientific era.

How, then, did they come to dominate the whole subcontinent and to place an enormous gap between themselves and the original inhabitants? The first instrument used was military power. The history of South Africa from 1657 (first Hottentot War) until 1906 (Bambata's Rebellion) is the history of conquest. The process varied in ferocity. The smaller Khoi (Hottentot) and San (Bushman) groups did not have the internal organization to resist dispossession of their lands, and once this occurred their tribal structure crumbled. Various "anti-vagrancy" laws had, by the end of the eighteenth century, ensured that they could survive only by serving the whites. The acquisition of land thus meant also the acquisition of labor, since the previous owners, deprived of their means of production, had no alternative but to work for the "new owners" in order to survive.

In the course of the nineteenth century the whites met and conquered the Bantu-speaking tribes, and although the conquest was more difficult, the pattern was the same. At times there were treaty agreements, but even when these were voluntarily entered into by both sides, they were understood differently by each, and the whites used their military superiority to impose their interpretations. The African tribes did not have private property or a concept of "ownership" as opposed to "use." Thus when they granted the whites permission to use bits of their tribal areas which they were not using at the time, they were rather surprised when the whites turned round and explained that the land was now the exclusive possession of the whites, whether they were using it or not. And if they objected, then the whites, often honestly believing that they had bought the land, used force to impose their definition of the situation.

To see this process of conquest and occupation, as being one whereby whites merely took over unused land in a half-occupied continent flies in the face of the historical facts. But even if it were true that the blacks were never dispossessed of land that they were using at the time, the argument would still be invalid. For a person is never using all his resources at once. The argument is analogous to that of a man who enters my bedroom when I am in the kitchen, and then explains, when I return, that it was unoccupied, so it is his bedroom now. And perhaps, into the bargain drives me into the pantry and takes over the kitchen as well, to punish me for complaining.

Military force and the threat of military force laid the basis for the inequality of South African society. As we have seen, white control of the bulk of the land also made available a large labor supply to them. This labor

The Eye of the Needle

supply was further controlled and channeled by two kinds of law:

1. The "anti-vagrancy" laws of the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries were designed to make it virtually impossible for the remnants of the Hottentots in the Cape to survive without working for whites and to make it difficult for them to change jobs once they were working. The Masters and Servants Acts, first introduced in the 1840s, provide severe penalties for breaking contracts, and so can be used, inter alia, against strikers. (Strikers are as I write being prosecuted under the Masters and Servants Proclamation in South West Africa.) The "pass laws," which have been gradually strengthened throughout the twentieth century, control the movement of black workers to suit the needs of white employers and especially of white farmers. Finally, specific legislation has made it illegal for Africans to strike under any circumstances, and the penalties are much higher than are those for whites who strike illegally. The lack of official recognition, plus administrative action, has made the growth of African trade unions very difficult.

Laws like these, controlling and regimenting black labor, are still absolutely central to the structure of South African society.

By rationalizing the exploitation of black labor and backing this exploitation by the law, and, behind the law, by armed force, these laws guarantee white economic privilege.

2. In the early days, when there was often still enough land in the reserves to go round, the poll tax was introduced. By making it necessary for Africans to pay money taxes it forced them to go to the only place where they could get money: the white-controlled market economy, where all they had to sell was their labor.

Up till about 1870 South Africa was still a predominantly rural society, with both black and white, away from the main ports, farming at a subsistence level. But the discoveries of gold and diamonds in the last third of the nineteenth century changed this. The mines provided a stimulus to capital accumulation and a stimulus to the growth of secondary industries. They directly provided new markets for agriculture, and, by requiring and financing railways, they indirectly opened up other markets to farmers. The mines were crucial to the whole development of the South African economy. Some of the capital, much of the machinery, and some of the special skills needed were imported from Europe. But the mainstay of the mines was cheap labor, cheap black labor. It was by underpaying the tightly controlled black labor force that the mine owners were able to accumulate the capital that laid the foundations for South Africa's industrial revolution. They saved, not by cutting back on their own consumption, but by drastically limiting the share of the product received by the black workers.

The accumulated capital is usually referred to today as "white capital." This is merely to add insult to injury. It is, if it has to have an ethnic label, white-controlled black capital. Any original capital from whites was re-funded years ago in fat dividend payments.

The mines also introduced a new type of "labor problem" into South African society. Up till then, the "labor problem" had been simply getting black laborers for white-owned farms. Whites were owners, blacks were unskilled workers. Now two new kinds of worker appeared. Mining and industry attracted new European immigrants, mostly skilled men who could command relatively high wages. At the same time, many white South Africans were moving off the land, lured by the hope of quick wealth and pushed by developments within agriculture. By the end of the nineteenth century the land which had been distributed in six thousand acre handouts to white farmers was beginning to run out. The Dutch system of inheritance had led to much subdivision of land into uneconomic units. The new pressure on the white-owned land was exacerbated first by the rinderpest epidemics of the 1890s and then by the British scorched-earth tactics of the 1899-1902 war,

The Eye of the Needle

in which many farmers lost all their possessions.

Unlike the European immigrants, these white workers were not accustomed to an urban environment and to the habits and practices of an industrial society. They had been educated, as had been the Africans in a different way, for life in a subsistence rural economy. On the technical level they had little superiority over the black workers also coming into the towns from the rural areas. In fact they were to a certain extent disadvantaged, in the sense that their cultural tradition tended to despise manual labor as "kaffir work."

But now they were in direct competition with Africans for jobs. They had only one essential advantage, and this was their political power. From 1870, gradually replacing the military conflict over possession of land and ultimately dwarfing in significance the conflict between British imperialism and local whites, the political quest of white workers for political control came to be the main theme of South African politics.

The mine-owners and industrialists wanted a cheap and docile labor force. Strong white unionism threatened industrial unrest and, by demanding job reservation, prevented the most efficient exploitation of the cheapest labor supply. On the other hand, all the capitalists' profits rested ultimately on continued white control, and to this extent white worker and white employers had an interest in common. Initially, black workers were too ill-organized and politically powerless to make anything other than occasional eruptions onto the scene.

The skilled immigrant workers came from a tradition of closed craft unions, in which the skilled worker often saw the unskilled mass as being as much of an enemy as the boss was. This tradition gradually combined with the local white racial attitudes and with white monopoly of political power in a common front of white workers, skilled and unskilled, against blacks. There was always a minority that preached class solidarity rather than race solidarity, but the immediate material interests of the white workers conflicted with those of the blacks.

This white worker front grew in strength and, after some great industrial conflicts—such as the 1913 and 1922 strikes, both of which led to fighting between white workers and troops—finally turned the defeat of the 1922 Rand rebellion into victory in the General Election of 1924, which brought a Labour Party-National Party coalition government into power.

This marked the definitive defeat of the white owning-class and their acceptance of the white workers into full partnership.

The Pact government entrenched the position of the white workers in three ways:

1. The Industrial Conciliation Act established a collective bargaining system that effectively excluded all Africans from the process and gave great power to the white trade unions. It thereby institutionalized the system whereby white workers shared with white owners the fruits of the exploitation of black labor.
2. It legalized the color bar on the mines, thus keeping black workers out of all those skilled jobs which were not also very dangerous. By the introduction of the "civilized labor" policy it ensured that white workers would have first option on even unskilled jobs in government service, particularly the railways, at higher rates of pay than blacks would receive in the same position. One of the main reasons why the Iron and Steel Corporation of South Africa (ISCOR) was started in 1927 was to provide jobs for white workers. The "civilized labor" policy was also extended to private industry by granting Import Permits that were tied to specific ratios of black to white workers,
3. The government ensured that the acquisition of skills, through ordinary and technical education, health and welfare schemes, paid for out of the general wealth of the country, should be an almost exclusively white

The Eye of the Needle

preserve.

The government represented a coalition of white workers and farmers, whose interests were not in conflict, since the rural work force was totally black, and the farmers benefited through very large subsidies, loans, improvement, and training schemes. These were once more paid for out of the general wealth, but were directed almost exclusively to white-owned agriculture, while black agriculture was neglected.

Thus the great inequalities in South African society are a result of the fact that whites have consistently used their military superiority and their political power.

(a) To monopolize the resources of the country (land and labor) and (b) to monopolize the acquisition of skills. Inequality did not just happen through white racial or cultural superiority. It is to a certain extent a product of the technological virtues of some whites, but it is also the product of the ethical vices of nearly all whites.

From this brief summary of key aspects of South African history, it seems to me to be legitimate to draw two conclusions about South Africa's present and future.

First, inter-group conflicts and tensions are ultimately bound up with economic inequality, with conflict over ownership of resources and of the fruits of industry. The alternative analysis of conflict, in terms of cultural and/or racial differences, is not even a half-truth. Cultural, racial, or religious differences, per se, are not a cause for conflict. They only become significant when these differences overlap with other significant differences of interest.

By this I do not mean to deny that race prejudice on the part of the whites has a role independent of economic self-interest. Race prejudice is a real phenomenon, compounded of ignorance of different cultures, of an unthinking explanation of very real social differences in terms of biological differences, and perhaps also of a psychological necessity to see the individuals one is mistreating as in some way deserving their fate.

Race prejudice, although a real factor, is based on ignorance and irrationality. But to remove that ignorance and irrationality through education will not remove the very real clash of material interest between two groups which, for historical reasons, can be defined in racial terms.

Nor do I mean to deny that the co-existence of different language, cultural, and religious groups can pose certain political problems. It is necessary, for example, that they should have equal education and employment opportunities. Where there are many language groups but one school system it is probable that members of one language group will be favored if that language has greater currency in the school system. On the other hand, if there are separate school systems it is necessary to ensure that they get equal facilities. There is thus a possibility of conflict between groups over finances at this level. But these kinds of conflicts are of a very secondary nature as compared to the major black-white confrontation over wealth. And designing a system of local and national government in such a way as to give power to minority groups can solve them technically. But technical solutions of this sort, although they must of course be embodied in the final solution to South Africa's conflicts, cannot of themselves resolve the conflict.

Second, a just society cannot be brought about in South Africa simply by a declaration of equality of opportunity. The whites are already so firmly entrenched that they probably don't need any of the legal barriers to black advancement anyway. If you allow some runners a half hour start, the race doesn't suddenly become equal when you finally permit the others to leave the starting post.

One thing, however, is clear. One specific characteristic of "white culture" is a major determinant in the

The Eye of the Needle

conflict system: the drive to accumulate wealth and the drive to seek personal satisfaction in the consumption of material goods, rather than, and often at the expense of, relations with other people. While this continues to be a dominant cultural trait, the details of the conflict may change, but the essentials will not.

We have seen therefore that the capitalist human model is (1) incompatible with Christian ethics, and (2) the root cause of conflict in South Africa.

Let us now turn to look at a model for a society that would be compatible with Christianity and free of destructive conflict.

4. PARTICIPATORY DEMOCRACY

A Christian society is one in which we prefer people to things, a society based on freely expressed love. Our problem is to work out what kind of institutions, social, political and economic, would be needed for such a society. In answering this question it is obviously going to be necessary to theorize, for such institutions do not as yet exist. But it will also be useful to look at those societies that have tried non-capitalist ways of life,

The Eye of the Needle

even if all we learn from them is what not to do. We can thereby discover some of the problems specific to post-capitalist societies and give the theorizing at least so practical reference points. In building an idea possible society, let us start from individuals and their needs for freedom and love, as postulated by the Christian model. In terms of this ideal human model, I need to be free from hidden conditioning processes. I need to be free to be open to other people. I need to be free from external social coercion. I need meaningful and creative work, work that is an expression of my own autonomous being and not something I do unwillingly and without understanding what my particular job is for. The social system required for the satisfaction of human needs must be one that (1) enables individuals to have maximum control over their social and material environment, and (2) encourages them to interact creatively with other people. These two ideas are combined in the idea of participatory democracy.

The essential problem is this: How can we design a set of institutions that will give all individuals power over their own lives without permitting them to exercise power over other people? How can we design political institutions that will give people the maximum freedom to choose what to do with their own lives?

In what circumstances do people come to exercise power over other people? In any contemporary society the most vital area of people's lives—the place, in which they spend the largest part of their waking hours, uses up their energy and around which they organize the rest of their life—is the work place. What are the power relationships at the work place? Our society is one of private ownership of the means of production. To own something is to have power over it. Because the owners of the factory have power over the factory and over its product, they can control the people who are dependent on these things—the workers. As a worker, I have no power over what I produce, where I produce, how I produce, or why I produce. The only power I have (assuming I am not an African in South Africa) is the power to remove myself from the control of one owner and to place myself in the control of another owner. The owner has power over me, power which may be delegated to a board of directors, a manager, executives, and foremen, thus creating a whole hierarchy of power, with me at the bottom, powerless on my own. An economic system is a system of power relationships. And power within the economy gives, as we shall see, power in other spheres of society as well. The first essential for democracy is that the workers should have power at their place of work, that is, that the enterprise should be controlled by those who work in it.

The trade union is a first step in the direction of power for the workers. Through organizational solidarity they are able to begin to assert some control over wages and over working conditions. But by the very nature of the case the trade union places merely a negative check on management, which retains day-to-day control. Furthermore, control over the product—that is, essentially over the profits—remains in the hands of the owner. As worker I can, with the aid of the trade union, make my work situation more comfortable, but I cannot make it more meaningful. This is manifest in the whole issue of restrictive practices. My job remains a means to satisfy personal ends external to it. My interest lies purely in more pay and shorter hours. I have no intrinsic interest in the job, because it is not something in which I can exercise my human autonomy.

Only full workers' control can permit this. How do workers run an enterprise? Do they have the skill necessary to do so? How are decisions to be made? An enterprise in a capitalist system contains two intertwined hierarchies: a hierarchy of control, and a hierarchy of technical knowledge. The boss has to have a means of ensuring (1) that the workers are actually working (this involves a hierarchy of control) and (2) that what they are doing is what is required for the efficient running of the factory (this involves a hierarchy of technical knowledge). The hierarchy of control is only necessary because of the basic conflict of interest between workers and employers. But the hierarchy of technical knowledge, and hence, to a certain extent, also of decision-making, will be necessary in any sort of enterprise. How can workers' control handle this problem? Not all decisions can be taken by the mass of workers together. And if all the workers are to be allowed to make their own decisions chaos will result. To solve these problems, the following institutions

The Eye of the Needle

will be necessary:

There would be regular meetings of all workers where together they can discuss and fix certain basic priorities: wages and wage scales, hours and times of work, and what to do with profits. It would be necessary to decide whether profits should be reinvested, distributed, or spent for purposes of collective consumption, either by improving conditions within the enterprise beyond the level dictated by sheer profitability, or by other local improvements not directly connected with the enterprise,

There would be an elected workers' council, whose members would continue as full-time workers during their terms of office. The council would have final responsibility for the regulations governing labor relations in the factory, for hiring and firing, for the annual balance-sheet, and for the distribution of surplus. It would prepare the annual plans and appoint and supervise the director and the other executives. The director would look after the day-to-day running of the enterprise. He or she would be accountable to the workers and might ultimately be dismissed by them.

At the other end of the scale from the director, the enterprise could be broken up into smaller units, each having a degree of autonomy over the organization of the work it is required to do in the context of the enterprise as a whole.

To prevent a new bureaucratic hierarchy from arising, the elected posts should not be renewable indefinitely. This would mean that there would always be both new and experienced members on the Workers' Council and management committees, and informal power to cliques could not easily develop.

Such a system (1) ensures the maintenance of the necessary hierarchy of knowledge through the appointed director and staff, that is, it ensures that people actually know how to do the jobs they are appointed to do; (2) ensures that the workers retain ultimate control through the workers' council and general meetings; and (3) ensures that as many people as possible participate actively through the rotation of office based on popular vote.

In capitalist society there is little relation between effort and reward, or between social contribution and reward. Reward is usually based either on property ownership or on educational level, which is in turn to a very great extent a function of social and economic privilege. But the problem is that in any society with a complex division of labor it is very difficult to estimate exactly how much each individual contributes to the final product. If I work twice as long as you at the same job, then I contribute twice as much. But what if I have special skills acquired through education, if I am an engineer and you are a factory hand? On the one hand my work probably contributes more than yours to the social product. But on the other hand, my work is perhaps intrinsically more satisfying than yours, the skills I have acquired were themselves the product of a whole common cultural history, and my education was paid for by the community. Taking all these factors into account, it is impossible to lay down hard and fast rules, or simply to let market forces, which take no account of social cost, set wages. The workers themselves must decide, through discussions in the concrete situation, who deserves what and why. The major objection always rose to such a system, obviously by employers and other members of the middle-classes, but also sometimes by workers themselves are: "But the workers don't have the competence to choose intelligently. They will choose the nicest guy, not the most qualified person. They will always vote for higher wages and for distributing rather than investing the profit, thus running down and finally ruining the business." This argument seems *prima facie* silly. After all, the idea that it is in the workers' interest, and in theirs alone under such a system, for an enterprise to stay in existence and to run efficiently, isn't really very difficult to grasp. And at elections they are not choosing between two impersonal candidates talking about abstractions on television, where perhaps all they have to go on is which one smiles more convincingly. They are choosing between individuals with whom they work day in and day out, and whose worth and reliability are made clear to them in many different situations. The

The Eye of the Needle

issues being dealt with are ones with which they are thoroughly familiar and which affect them immediately and obviously and personally.

From where, then, comes the argument that workers are incompetent and couldn't possibly understand or operate such a system? It comes from "common sense thinking" and the "human nature" argument. In capitalist society the workers are not interested in the enterprise itself; why should they be, since it does not belong to them? They have neither opportunity nor stimulus to see it as a whole and to understand how what each individual does is related to the rest. The situation is one in which they are told to do, give little opportunity for the exercise of their initiative or intelligence, and so do not develop initiative or intelligence. One writer compares the situation of the worker with the situation of the child: The main thrust of the autocratic organization is to drive the mature adult back into childhood. The mature individual strives to take an active part in his world, but the chain of command renders him *passive*. He seeks to be independent and to control his own behavior, but as an employee he is rendered *dependent* and essentially lacking in control over his own behavior. The mature individual strives for the long time perspective, but as he does not possess or have access to necessary information at work which would permit this, his time, *perspective* is consequently *shortened*. He seeks to achieve relationships based on equality, but as a *subordinate*, he becomes just that, once again as in childhood (Paul Blumberg, *Industrial Democracy* [New York: Schocken, 1969], p. 131).

The enterprise is not only a work place; it is also a socialization process. Once the workers have been through this process, it is scarcely surprising that they do not appear to have the competence to run an enterprise. What the capitalist system has made the workers into is then produced as evidence for the impossibility of any other social system.

But in fact it is one of the strongest arguments for the absolute necessity of an alternative social system. For, as we have seen, it is only if the workers participate in the control of the central part of their lives—their work—that they can develop the personal qualities of autonomy, initiative, and self-confidence necessary for our human model. Workers' control is not only a means whereby I can control a specific area of my life. It is an educational process in which I can learn better to control all areas of my life and can develop both psychological and interpersonal skills in a situation of cooperation with my fellows in a common task. There is ample sociological evidence that participation in decision-making, whether in the family, in the school, in voluntary organizations, or at work, increases the ability to participate and increases that sense of competence on the part of the individual that is vital for balanced and autonomous development. Participation through workers' control thereby lays the basis for love as a constant rather than as a fleeting relationship between people and is thus the basis for Christian community in the work situation.

There are experiments in workers' control in a number of countries. In each country, of course, workers control within enterprises has to be seen within the overall social context. Various factors can complicate the operation of workers' control: the level of economic development, the political system, the type of enterprise in which workers' control occurs, and the mode of introduction of workers' control. In the following brief survey I can do no more than indicate which of these factors is relevant. I shall make no attempt at complete evaluation. These are examples from whose problems we can learn, rather than models we should imitate.

In most advanced capitalist countries there are small numbers of firms run by workers either as the result of a decision by the original owner or because they were started by a group of workers with egalitarian intentions. Units such as these, where members are self-selected and hence highly motivated and of a relatively high standard of education, are probably the most immediately successful. The kibbutzim of Israel, communally owned and run farms, are in a similar position, often with the added advantage of a strong religious and nationalistic cement.

The Eye of the Needle

In some countries particular social sections are worker-controlled. In the Soviet Union one form of collective farm, the kolkhoz, is supposed to be run by the workers through general meetings and an elected management board. Although there is more real worker autonomy in the kolkhoz than in the sovkhos, or state farm, with its state-appointed director, nevertheless the presence of a bureaucratic and highly centralized Communist Party means that even the kolkhoz is not really an example of workers' control.

In Tanzania, the Ujamaa village schemes are the most impressive African examples of workers' control. Julius Nyerere outlines the organizational principles as follows:

A really socialist village would elect its own officials and they would remain equal members with the others, subject always to the wishes of the people. Only in relation to work discipline would there be a hierarchy, and then such officials would merely be acting for the village as a whole.

Let us take an example. It would be a meeting of the villagers which would elect the officers and the committee, and a meeting of the village would decide whether or not to accept or to amend any detailed proposals for work organization which the committee had drawn up in the light of general directions given by earlier meetings. Let us assume that a forty-member village meeting agrees to a cotton farm of 40 acres and a food farm of 40 acres. It would be the committee's job to propose where in the land available these different crops should be planted, and to propose the times and the organization of joint work on the land. At the same time the committee would have to make proposals for the other work which had been decided upon—perhaps the digging of a trench for a future piped water supply, or the making of a new road, or the improvement of village drainage. These detailed proposals they would bring to the next village meeting, and once they had been accepted it would be a job of the officers to ensure that all members carried out the decisions, and to report to a general meeting any problems as they occurred. As the village became more established and the need for a village carpenter, or a village nursery, or a village shop became more pressing, the committee would work out proposals as to how these could be organized, and run by a member for the common benefit. The village officials would also be responsible for liaising with other villages and with the general machinery of government (*Freedom and Socialism* [Dar es Salaam: Oxford University Press, 1968], pp. 353-54). In the *Ujamaa* villages the organizational problems seem to be very simple ones. But there is one very difficult problem that the *Ujamaa* villages are designed to cope with and seem to be coping with at least more successfully than other institutions. This is the problem of introducing new agricultural techniques, whether they are organizational or technological, to a naturally conservative peasantry. The government can neither simply give these techniques nor command that they should be adopted. It is only if these techniques relate to a felt need of the peasants, and can be shown to them to be relevant to that need, that they will be adopted. And only if they feel that they have themselves really participated in the decision will the peasants maintain the machinery or keep up the organisation. The participatory structure of the *Ujamaa* village is ideally suited to this. The system is in its early stages yet. Moreover, by its very nature it cannot make for rapid *economic* development. But it does seem to be laying the foundations for all-around social and political development by drawing the peasants into a change process without disrupting their lives or their value-systems and self-concepts and by giving them the skills of organization and initiative that are vital to personal autonomy. Thereby it is also laying the foundation for long-term solid economic development,

In Eastern Europe the idea of workers' control is deeply embedded in the Marxist ideology, although obscured by Communist Party practice. However, it tends to emerge in moments of crisis, as in Poland in 1956, and again at the end of 1970, with the fall of Gomulka as a result of workers' protests. In Czechoslovakia workers control was one of the most important developments in the later reforms of 1968, and in some industries it even continued to spread for a while after the Soviet invasion. Workers' management of a kind also operates in China. My information on the actual working of the system is inadequate, but the principles of the organizational structure are clear. Prior to the Cultural Revolution, there

The Eye of the Needle

were two forms of management. In the major industries a committee elected by all Communist Party members in the factory, rather than by all the workers played the leading managing role. This committee was supposed to represent the Party, rather than the workers. But it was supposed to work in consultation either with workers' representatives, or with mass meetings of workers. It had control over day-to-day running, but no financial autonomy. This is certainly not an example of workers' control. However, in the countryside there was a different organizational structure, which seems to have been maintained since the Cultural Revolution. Each "commune" averages about eight thousand people and includes a variety of agricultural activities as well as some light industry. It is run by a committee nominated by a meeting of representatives of all the inhabitants of the commune. This committee both runs the business affairs of the commune and is the organ of local government. The commune has a considerable degree of financial autonomy, in respect of distributing or reinvesting income. It is subdivided into brigades and teams, with the team, which might vary from ten to sixty families, as the basic work and accounting unit. The team enters into production contracts with the higher organizational levels, and the team among its members, usually on the basis of work-points, distributes the profits. Alongside this organizational differentiation, there are also different types of property ownership: personal property in the house and garden; team property in certain farming materials; brigade property in agricultural land, draught animals, and farm buildings; commune property in workshops, heavy machinery, transport, and marketing co-operatives; and finally state property in enterprises created with state aid.

This is a fairly flexible system, with a number of different levels of social integration and of participation. To what extent the existence of the strong Communist Party offsets these decentralizing tendencies is not clear. However, one of the main objectives of the Cultural Revolution was to decentralize control by destroying the bureaucracies of the Communist Party and of the state, and to replace them with much greater workers participation, both in industry and in the communes. Most observers seem to agree that this has in fact occurred, though they disagree on the extent. Most observers also seem to agree that the system is working fairly successfully in economic terms. But, as I have already pointed out, there have been no detailed studies of its workings.

In Peru, the present military government has instituted workers' control in some of the large plantations, confiscated in recent land reforms. There have been serious political problems, connected, on the one hand, with the fact that there is conflict between the military government and the trade unions in these areas, and, on the other hand, with the fact that it is only the hitherto most productive sector that is worker-controlled, and there is an almost total absence of a party or an ideology that could integrate this sector with the rest in a common development project.

Yugoslavia is the only country in which workers' control (1) is applied in all sectors of society, (2) has been in existence for a considerable period of time, now about twenty years, and (3) has been fairly closely studied by sociologists, and therefore can give us some reliable conclusions as to how it works in practice.

Let us look at the possible complicating factors. First, the existence of a strong party, the Communist League, may limit the reality of participation. The League certainly does not play the same centralizing role as does the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. There are nevertheless limitations on political freedom that must affect the democratic working of the system. Second, although the system has been in existence for twenty years, the actual detailed workings have changed frequently. This could be expected to make the system more difficult to understand, and hence to discourage participation. Studies indicate (a) that of necessity there is a very high degree of participation in elected office, since there are, on one estimate, about one million elective offices and regulations to ensure that there is a rapid turnover in office, and (b) that the level and competence of participation has increased over the years, as would be expected, given the educative effect of participation. Initially, the workers tended to concentrate on "welfare" issues, leaving the more important technical decisions to the management. As the system has developed they have come to

The Eye of the Needle

spend more time on higher management issues and less time on peripheral issues.

The major *dangers* in the system are those that beset any organization.

First, one or a few individuals may informally take control of and monopolize the elected positions, since once they are elected they have control over the flow of information, over procedure in meetings, and so on. If the other workers do not really know what is going on they cannot defend themselves adequately. This danger is of course minimized when offices are rotated, but this cannot rule it out entirely. Second, the greater danger is that the managers, who have direct access to all the information and who draw up plans, will be able to impose their wishes and dominate the elected members. There is considerable evidence of this happening in Yugoslavia.

How can these problems be handled? We must distinguish between two different issues: (1) does a division into decision-makers and non-decision-makers tend to arise?

(2) Is the system such that a group of decision-makers can, consciously or unconsciously, use their special positions to acquire material privileges and so become a new "ruling class"? The second case would obviously be much more serious than the first. However, given the high level of interest in salaries and work conditions displayed by the workers, they probably would not let it happen. At least it seems safe to say that there is nothing *in the work* situation that would encourage the rise of a new privileged class.

A number of measures are possible to *counteract tendencies toward oligarchy*. First, the organizational and electoral system must be as simple as possible. In Yugoslavia the workers usually present candidates by the trade unions, rather than directly. If the workers wish to present their own candidates they have to go through a complicated and discouraging procedure.

Second, within the enterprise decision-making should be as decentralized as possible. If workers in a very large factory are told to make decisions about the factory as a whole, with no experience of decision-making at intermediate levels, they are unlikely to be able to relate the problems of the whole factory to their own experience, and so are not likely to understand them. The more intermediate levels of decision-making there are, the easier it is for individuals to get a meaningful view of the whole,

Third, there must be adequate information flow and adequate grievance mechanisms. Here the trade union could play a role, first by making sure that all available information is placed before the worker in as digestible a form as possible, and, second, by representing the interest of the individual as against the interest of the group as a whole, which is watched over by the workers' council. Fourth, the process whereby no elective post can be filled for more than two or four years needs to be reinforced. It seems reasonable that the managerial staff should spend a period each year working on the factory floor. This would serve the social role of preventing the growth of class differences and antagonisms and the practical economic role of making sure that the managers do not get out of touch with the level at which their decisions have to be implemented, that they know from experience the practical problems of the factory floor and the level of skill and involvement of the ordinary workers. None of these measures is finally going to eliminate all trace of hierarchy and all trace of skill differences. But this is not at issue. We are trying to decrease hierarchy and dependence and increase autonomy, as much as possible, rather than trying to reach an impossible perfection. We are trying to ensure that those hierarchies that exist do not place barriers between people and do not require patterns of authority and deference,

The usual argument brought against these proposals is that they would be inefficient, that valuable trained manpower would be wasted, that rotation of office prevents the best people from staying at the top, and that meetings and elections waste work time. There are two counters to this: First, the argument assumes a

The Eye of the Needle

particular criterion of efficiency, the one used in capitalist society. It is assumed that the *only* purpose of an enterprise is to produce goods in such a way as to produce the maximum possible profit for the owner. So something is "efficient" if it helps in this process and "inefficient" if it does not. However, in our Christian model the enterprise is not designed only to produce goods as cheaply as possible. The enterprise is also a part of the life of each worker, and one of its products is an educated and autonomous individual. The criteria for "efficiency" in such a system are obviously going to be in some respects different. Second, even if we concentrate only on "economic" efficiency, the argument has a major weakness. It rests implicitly on the hoary distinction made by capitalist economists between "initiative" and "labor" as factors of production. This almost racist idea assumes that the world is divided up into those who have "initiative" and those who have "labor." But to the extent that this is a true description of reality, it is, as we have seen, a product of capitalist work relationships. Workers' control is likely to release the creative initiative of workers and thereby to increase rather than decrease production.

5. THE POLITICS OF SOCIALISM

The principle of our ideal society is freedom. I have attempted to indicate which work institutions maximize

The Eye of the Needle

freedom; now I intend to look at political institutions.

First one must ask what political institutions are for.

Why are they necessary at all?

In a very small society, such as an independent tribe of a few hundred members, all relationships between people are "face to face" relationships. If I do something that affects another person I know that I have done it, and that person knows that I have done it. The effects of it are clear to both of us, and the other can, if necessary, pay me back in kind for my act, whether it is good or bad.

However, once a society gets bigger and more complicated, this is no longer true. My acts have consequences for people I don't know and may never even see. If I discover a way of weaving cloth by machine I can put a whole countryside of hand-weavers out of work. The sewage pumped into the river may kill the fish and poison the fishermen. Relations between people are no longer only direct and unmediated. They are also mediate indirectly by the environment and by other people. It is necessary, in any large society, to devise some social institutions to handle the problems created by this.

Our worker-controlled enterprise does not exist in a vacuum. It uses social resources; its products are used by other people; its workers need to use roads, schools, and hospitals. The enterprise and the individual workers thereby enter into indirect relationships with many individuals and ultimately with the whole society. They affect other people and other people affect them. What happens to the individual's personal freedom in this situation? And, when relations between people are mediated rather than direct, what happens to my moral duties toward other people? There are many ways in which hidden coercion and hidden evil can operate. I cheat on my income tax payments, and somewhere at the other end of the country an unknown child may die because there is not enough money for hospitals.

It is clear that in order for me to preserve my control over myself and to carry out my responsibilities toward other people I must join with them in attempting to replace these blind unconscious interdependencies with some form of planned, conscious coordination. We must decide as a group what our priorities are, what we intend to use our resources for, and precisely how we are to depend on one another. We need to coordinate those of our actions through which we affect one another; we need to plan our society in such a way as to give us the maximum amount of freedom in our private lives. This is the role of political institutions.

Workers' control in the enterprise is a necessary condition for individual freedom, but it is not a sufficient condition. The enterprise itself has to be coordinated with other enterprises through some sort of planning mechanism. Otherwise it may exploit the rest of society by charging monopoly prices, by misusing resources that others need, by polluting the environment. To prevent these and other difficulties, economic planning is necessary.

Problems immediately arise. What happens to the workers' control of the enterprise if the enterprise itself is subject to the overriding dictates of the plan? Who makes the plan? Does not the making of the plan concentrate power in the hands of a few? In the face of these problems it is often argued that a society based on private ownership of the means of production provides for much greater personal freedom than could a "socialist" society. For, it is argued, instead of the one power centre of a socialist society, in which both political and economic power is concentrated in the hands of the planners, there is, in capitalist society, a multiplicity of different power centres, social, economic, and political, which restrain one another by competition. Trade unions and capitalists, state and church, consumer and producer, all mutually restrain one another, and each gives the individual shelter from the other.

The Eye of the Needle

This argument is based on two mistakes: a mistake about the nature of capitalist society, and a mistake about the nature of power and constraint. Destroying these illusions will help us better to understand the politics of participatory democracy.

Wealth is, as we have seen, power over other people. In capitalist society that power is heavily concentrated in a few hands. Inequality of property and income depend not on innate ability, but largely on prior inequalities of property ownership, passed on by inheritance. The right of property ownership is not "natural." Heirs are not born with unbreakable umbilical cords connecting them to their property. The right of property ownership is a *legal right*, backed by the power of the state. The law defines property and what may be done with property.

That is, the inequality of wealth and of power is backed ultimately by the coercive power of state.

Why, then, given theoretical ultimate equality of political power in democratic capitalist societies, do the people not deprive the minority of their control over the means of production? There are two major reasons why they have very rarely done so in any consistent way in developed capitalist countries.

First, wealth is not only a form of power in itself; it also gives access to other forms of power. The vote is not the only weapon used in the political struggle. Other crucial weapons are organization and information. Wealth can build political organizations and can control information, through controlling the press and the other mass media. The wealthy are not, of course, a completely homogeneous group. There are clashes of interest between landowners and factory-owners, between arms-manufacturers and butter-manufacturers, between groups who depend on imports and groups who depend on exports. But underlying these different interests there is a basic community of interest in the protection of private ownership of the means of production and in the restraining of the workers. The political power of wealth is never mobilized against these common goals. The press groups, owned and run by the wealthy, need not necessarily consciously lie. They have to select news and views, and they do so in terms of criteria that assume the inherent desirability of the capitalist system. They describe a strike as the owner sees it, not as the worker sees it. In South Africa they print "white news," not "black news." Most major newspapers assume the naturalness of the values embodied in the status quo, and, by reporting in terms of these values, in fact reinforce them and thereby play a role in the socializing process.

Second, people react to a social situation, formulate their demands, and express their agreement or dissent, in terms of the values and assumptions they have acquired from society. A capitalist society, like any other society, survives largely because most individuals in the society accept its naturalness, because they accept the dominant ideology, because they do not know that any other form of society is possible.

In addition to the general socialization process to which each individual in the society is subject, there is also one very important element of differential socialization. That is, in one particular way the rich are socialized differently from the poor and are thus socialized in a way that reinforces their control. In most capitalist societies there is a tendency for political participation to decrease with income. The poor participate less, vote less, and know less than the rich. There are some obvious environmental reasons for this: The poor tend to have less free time, no cars for going to vote in the rain, lower levels of education. But a more fundamental reason lies in the socialization process. As we have seen, the workers are trained to obey, are taught to see parts (their own jobs) and not wholes (the factory), are taught to think only of their own positions and to give little thought to a morrow that is beyond their control. That is, they do not develop the thought structures and the personal confidence that would enable them to participate effectively. Wealthy individuals full of the self-confidence given them by their social status and playing roles in which they have a wide perspective on the world—a perspective from a particular and falsifying ideological standpoint, but a wide perspective, nevertheless—are much more able psychologically to participate in politics and, wher

The Eye of the Needle

participating, to manipulate the political institutions to their advantage. I do not wish to argue that capitalist forces are so strongly entrenched that they cannot be removed, in normal democratic countries, by normal democratic processes. Nor do I wish to imply that anti-capitalist forces are necessarily suppressed. Rather, the various factors mentioned have made it possible for capitalism to survive up to now by merely making concessions in times of crisis that temporarily assuage grievances without really weakening the capitalists source of power. Political bargaining and the competition of various interest groups, including trade unions, take place within the unquestioned context of this power structure. The illusion of pluralism exists within a fundamentally monistic structure.

So far I have dealt with the "human institutions" of capitalist society: the state and legal apparatus, political organization, and information services. But these "human institutions" are not the only forms in which other people constrain me in society. As we have seen, if someone pollutes the river above my fishing grounds and poisons the fish, this places severe constraints upon my actions. There are always three different sets of forces limiting what I can do: the forces of nature, direct pressures from other people, and hidden social forces. The whole point of planning is to bring these hidden forces under control, whereas capitalism lets them run wild.

The business people in the "free enterprise" economy think they are free because there are no individuals standing over their shoulders giving them instructions. Nevertheless, they are severely limited in what they can do with their money by the forces of the market. If they do not obey these forces they will lose their money. They do not see this as limiting their "freedom of enterprise," however, because they see the market as having the same status as "nature." When they go bankrupt this is, to them, no more the result of other people limiting their own freedom than it would be if a tree fell down across the road in front of their car. And if their workers, now finding themselves unemployed, were to blame people for it and complain that they were not free, they would be laughed at.

But in fact the market is not a force of nature. It is *other people* going about their business. It is other people limiting what I can do. When there is a slump and a rise in unemployment the limitation being placed on people thereby are a result of investment decisions and other commercial decisions made by other people. When I send my apples to market and find that there is a glut, it is because other people have been planting, growing, picking, and packing too many apples for the needs of yet other people, who will not buy any more apples because they have had enough. The force of the market is what I have called a hidden social, force. It is other people telling me what to do.

In any society I have to adjust what I am doing to fit in with what other people are doing, and vice versa. To call a society in which I am told what to do, indirectly and invisibly, a "free society," while calling a society in which the limitations operate directly an "unfree society," is just nonsense.

The criterion for freedom cannot be whether or not other people limit what I do, since this occurs in all societies. Rather we must define a free society as one in which (a) the limits are as wide as possible; (b) all individuals have a say in deciding where it is necessary for those limits to be; and (c) all individuals know how and why they are being limited. None of these conditions hold in capitalist society. Some limitations are decided politically, but the most important ones are those imposed by hidden social forces, and nobody decides what these limits should be, nor how and why they are being limited by them. The limitations that are imposed on various individuals are grossly unequal. The limitation imposed on the capitalist by a slump cannot be meaningfully compared with the limits placed on the workers freedom of action when they are unemployed. And the essence of capitalism is that limitations should be placed on the workers' consumption and leisure so that the capitalists can accumulate wealth—which is power to free themselves from many limitations.

The Eye of the Needle

A free society, one in which I cooperate with my fellows in deciding how to maximize all our freedom for the individual, requires planning. This apparently paradoxical statement means that, in order for me to retain the maximum of personal freedom, other areas of my life must conform to a social plan, that is must recognize the rights of other people. A plan to attempt to state and protect the rights of each individual from infringement by the acts of others.

To go into the details of the problems of Economic Planning would require a book, a book that clearly must be written, but that cannot be included here. However, at least a brief sketch of the possibilities and problems is required. Perhaps we can best approach this by asking the following questions: Now that we have got rid of the gross social inequalities that arise from private ownership of the means of production and have placed the workers in control of their own enterprises, why do we need economic planning at all? Can we not place these worker-controlled enterprises in a "free market economy" and leave the ordinary play of market forces to decide what they shall produce and what they will charge for the goods or services that they do produce? The answer is that although such a "free market economy" is likely to achieve somewhat better results than an ordinary capitalist one, there are still a number of problems.

1. *The distinction between "private costs" and "social costs" will still remain.* "Private costs" are those costs of production that are actually met by the enterprise. Social costs include costs that have to be met by society as a whole as a result of this particular enterprise's production. The most obvious example of this is pollution. If a particular factory pollutes the atmosphere of a town then the loss to the other individuals and enterprises through corrosion and increased expense for cleaning, and perhaps too through illness, which both affects the individual and decreases production, is not met by the factory itself. These costs do not appear in the price of the product, and therefore the total cost of that particular product to the society is not reflected by the market mechanisms. Some allowance has to be made for these "spillover" effects.

Apart from pollution, the other major problem in this area is connected with centralization. Once you have a couple of factories and a town in one place, an inherent centralizing tendency begins to operate. Each new factory gains certain advantages by being situated near the old factories and near the market constituted by the town. But each new enterprise takes into account only its own costs, not the costs to the community as a whole. These costs are of two kinds: (a) Actual economic cost incurred in building more houses and schools, in providing better roads for the increased traffic, etc. Up to a certain size, some centralization actually lowers the costs, but once the city becomes very large, the costs of movement of goods and people within the city tend to escalate very rapidly, (b) The social and psychological costs to the individuals who are removed from their habitual social setting and placed in what is often noisy, dirty, crowded, and anonymous city. While the town is reasonably small there will probably be an increase in community, human contact, and cultural opportunity, but this can be rapidly cancelled out in very large cities. So even if there were economic arguments in favor of centralization, there might be social arguments in favor of planned decentralization.

2. Some of the problems of uneven growth and inflation would still occur in such an economy. If investment is not fairly well coordinated one is likely to get the familiar pattern of booms and slumps. Demand for a particular product increases. Several different enterprises invest more to meet the demand. Together they produce too much, prices drop, production is cut, some of the goods and some of the machinery are wasted, and some people are put out of work. With industrial secrecy out the way, much of this problem could perhaps be met by simply supplying up-to-date information on likely demand and on the investment intentions of various related industries.

But even here there would be actual planning need. Once we know that demand for shoes will increase by 20 percent next year, and that each of the three shoe factories is able and willing to increase production to meet that demand on its own, we still have to decide precisely what proportion of the demand each factory should meet. Here social issues come into play. In which areas are jobs needed most? In which area is it easiest to

The Eye of the Needle

provide facilities for the increased numbers of workers? The three factories between them, at the industry level, can decide some of these problems but others may need to be decided at the state level. It is possible to have a considerable degree of flexibility through a variety of planning mechanisms to meet different problems at different levels.

3. *There is the problem of individual consumption versus collective consumption.* Some things I use by myself—food, clothes, and cameras. Others I use with other people—schools, roads, and beaches. One of the characteristics in capitalist societies is the frequent contrast between "private affluence" and "public squalor": television sets in slums, shiny new cars on dirty, polluted city streets. In any society much consumption must be collective, and that requires considerable interference with the market by public bodies, as well as measures to ensure that individual consumption does not conflict with what, by common consent, are more basic forms of public consumption.

Given limited resources, it may be necessary to channel those resources from building hotels to building schools, from private cars to public transport. For instance, a fast and efficient public transport system could be developed if there were no private cars on the roads. Upkeep on the roads would cost less, roads could be narrower, expensive accidents and supervision would decrease, and, of course, one person would not waste social resources on large cars each inhabited. But this would involve a conscious collective allocation of resources. Here we have a choice between choices. Banning cars deprives people who can afford them of the choice between public and private transport. Permitting cars, at the inevitable expense of public transport, deprives those who cannot afford cars of any reasonable transport system at all. It also, in a vicious circle, places constraints on those who do have cars. For the more cars there are the worse is the public transport and the more necessary it is to have a car. But the more people who have cars, the more congested the roads become, and so the less useful the car becomes.

There are three major levels of collective consumption. The first is inside the enterprise. At least some of the profits of the enterprise would be spent on the collective needs of the workers as a whole. Making the enterprise itself into a decent environment is, of course, the first of such collective needs. But other needs too, such as housing, further education, and entertainment, could be handled on the enterprise level. The second level is the municipality. If the workers were represented via their enterprises on municipal boards, then the municipality would have direct access to finances, and could be to a considerable extent autonomous in health, education, town planning and so on. Finally, certain items of collective consumption pertain to the state level. For example, a common transport policy would be necessary. If some communities concentrated on public transport and others on private transport, both would lose out.

4. Problems of concentration of wealth at one end of unemployment at the other end could still arise. Unregulated competition between even worker controlled factories could lead to the more "efficient factories" undercutting the others and driving them out of business.

This might produce commodities with a lower market price, but it would have unfortunate social consequences, in the long run even for the successful competitors. For competition of this nature could escalate to a situation where narrow economic criteria of efficiency pushed all others into the background. The problem is this. On the one hand, the community cannot let its shoe factory workers make life in their factory so comfortable that shoes become very high priced, so that they thereby, exploit other workers who are "producing" their kinds of goods more cheaply. On the other hand, the community does not want a "benefit-cutting-" war, in which each factory is gradually forced to abolish all its worker-benefits in order to survive in the face of competition from the other. Thus some degree of social control over pricing is necessary.

5. *To prevent unemployment, some degree of social control over investment is also necessary.* Jobs must be

The Eye of the Needle

created for new workers. The creating and sitting of a new enterprise is of such importance to so many people that the society as a whole should play a major role here. Probably each individual enterprise should retain some of its profits for purposes of technological innovation and expansion but should also contribute to a central fund out of which major new investments could be made. This would enable the central authority to maintain regionally balanced development and also to keep the rate of investment at the level required for full employment.

How are these problems to be solved? Some combination of four factors seems to be necessary:

1. *Some market mechanism must operate*, even if only because it is physically impossible to plan all prices and to predict all demands.
2. *Financial instruments can be used*; obviously each enterprise will have to pay a certain amount in tax to cover common services. Tax incentives and disincentives can be used for various kinds of industry.
3. *The efficient collection and distribution of information can help each enterprise* to take into account what is happening or is likely to happen in other enterprises when it draws up its plan. This could be combined with elements of "indicative planning," whereby priorities for growth and change are stated as targets, rather than stated as commands.

The availability of information is important not only for the factory as a unit, but also for the individual workers within the factory in their attempts to control the factory. Here modern data processing and storing techniques open out wide possibilities. Even in relatively poor countries it would be possible to establish a national computer network available to everybody and storing all relevant information.

Democratic social application of computers... implies that massive information will be freely available. This points immediately to an important political issue. The stock-in-traded privilege and class power is "restricted information." If the public at large lacks vital information, they lack the weapons of effective criticism. The contemporary technical revolutions quite accurately described by many as the information revolution.

Rapid analysis of massive information can, under certain circumstances, be a powerful instrument of control and domination by small select groups ruling over others, but the small technological facilities can provide instruments of democratisation and effective continuous participation in decision making.... The general user would require skills no more difficult to acquire than literacy or numeracy, and the highly specialised services could be available to him so that he could make the best use of available computing power (Stephen Bodlington, "Socialism, Democracy and the Computer," in Ken Coates, *Can the Workers Run Industry?* [London: Sphere 1968]).

4. *Finally, some elements of pure imperative planning of production will be necessary* in the form of we need x numbers of schools this year: you will build them and you and you will provide the raw materials at y and z prices." That is, production must ultimately be based on estimate of the needs, priorities, and resources of society as a whole. The techniques to be used in this some of which are already used in capitalist countries are sufficiently varied for a subtle planning mechanism to be devised.

I am aware that the major problem is that of precisely how these various factors are to be mixed and that have not solved this problem here. But all I can do with the space available is to make the crucial point that planning does not require that a central authority bureaucratically make all decisions.

Individual freedom requires planning. But now we are back with our initial problem. Who is to plan? And,

The Eye of the Needle

more important, who is to plan the planners? We have seen, within the individual enterprise, the dangers and the problems of concentration of power, even with one person-one vote. In society as a whole the greater size, the greater complexity, and the greater distance between the point of decision and the individual magnify these problems. Here, even more than in the factory, we cannot hope for the perfection of complete equality.

Once more, there are two problems. The first is to prevent those individuals who, being at the top of the necessary decision hierarchy, have more power from using the power to their own material advantage. This is something that may be done consciously, through corruption, but also can occur gradually and unconsciously. Feeling important and having high prestige, it is very easy to accept unconsciously that one should go immediately to the head of the queue, that one needs a chauffeur-driven car "to save time parking," that one needs a specially comfortable apartment because one is subject to special tensions and because one often has to work at home. Insensibly, convincing rationalizations of this sort can produce an elite who has a vested interest in maintaining their positions.

The second problem, which shades into the first, is to ensure that the decision-makers do not, through the very nature of their jobs, become isolated from the people, unaware of what the people want, and, hiding behind a hedge of technical jargon, perhaps no longer even able to communicate with ordinary people.

The Soviet Union is probably the classical example of both these processes. But the question is: Are they inevitable processes? To prevent them, those at the top have to know what those at the bottom want, and those at the bottom have to know what those at the top are doing. Is this possible? The only way that we can attempt to prevent these things from happening is (1) to make the decision hierarchies as short as possible by the greatest possible decentralization, (2) to make the conditions of life of the decision-makers as similar as possible to those of the people, and (3) to provide for the greatest possible knowledge and understanding on the part of the public of the problems of government. How can these three conditions be satisfied?

Some of the things that I do affect only myself. Some affect my wife and family. Others affect my neighborhood. Yet others affect, indirectly and slightly, people all over the province or all over the country. Obviously we cannot on each occasion assemble the entire group of people who will be affected by my act and ask for their opinion. But we can isolate certain classes of acts that affect certain categories of people, for example the factory, neighborhood, town, province, country. On the basis of the most relevant of these categories we can have a number of different autonomous decision making agencies. This prevents concentration of power and increases the possibility of meaningful participation.

The problem of privilege can be met, as in the case of the factory, by keeping the wage gap low, by making part of the planner's job an annual three-month stint working in a factory or on a farm, and also by limiting the period for which executive positions can be held. The problem of information for the decision-makers will meet in part by the period of factory work, but this is not adequate in itself. The central planning body is meant to represent the interest of the community as a whole, but it must never be allowed to forget that this "interest of the whole" is made up of a large number of completely partial interests. Whether to spend more money on pensions or more money on schooling, whether new capital should be invested in agriculture or in light industry, whether a new factory should be built at Newcastle or at Saldanha Bay: There are clashes of interest in all these cases. It is vital that these interests should be free to make themselves heard. This requires political freedom.

The basis of political freedom lies in the workers' control of their enterprise. This gives them their power. The central body would have to allocate to the enterprise tasks that seemed reasonable to the workers, or else it would have to use the socially expensive method of coercion. That is, the workers in a particular enterprise would, in virtue of their organization and of their physical control of the plant, have some power to resist

The Eye of the Needle

norms or priorities that they considered totally unjustified. These are not absolute guarantees, but then no guarantee is absolute. Unless individuals have some direct control over some of the society's resources and some organized relationship with other people, they have no power at all to resist.

Finally, the question of knowledge on the part of the people brings us back to the educative function of participation. As we have seen, this operates on two levels. It equips individuals with the psychological capacity to take part in decision-making, and it also helps them to get the information required to make good decisions. At least part of the reason why public opinion surveys in the western democracies reveal such a low level of knowledge and understanding of social issues lies in the very nature of the political structures of these countries. I vote for a leader every four or five years. But in between elections I do not participate in the decision-making. "They" do it all for me. When election time comes round again I do not know what has been happening, for there is no incentive in my daily life for me to follow what has been happening. What parliament decides affects my life considerably, but when and how and where it affects me I cannot see, since there is no thread for me to follow from my own situation to the problems facing society as a whole.

However, my role as co-participant in the enterprise provides the missing thread. I am obliged to consider both the economic problems of the enterprise as a whole and the social problems of housing, feeding, educating, and healing the workers. On the basis of this, it is possible for the problems of society to begin to make sense to me and for me to evaluate intelligently what is happening and to participate intelligently at higher levels of government.

Thus participatory democracy based on workers' control can provide a genuinely plural structure. The dominance of one particular political interest group—the owners of the means of production—is replaced by equal competition between a variety of groups who are interdependent and whose power is proportionate to the number of members of each group. There is no dictatorship of any one group over any other group.

One final point needs to be dealt with: the question of private property and of motivation to work. What happens to *ownership* in a participatory democracy? Roberta Dahl writes:

What happens to "property rights" in such a system? Who *owns* the factory, railroad, bank, and retail firm? In this kind system the great myth of the nineteenth century stands exposed; ownership is dissolved into its various components. What is left? A kind of ghostly penumbra around the enterprise. The enterprise is described in the constitution as social property. But it might be closer to the mark to say that *no one owns it*. It is not, certainly, owned by the state or shareholders. The workers own it. The point is that property is a bundle of rights. Once the pieces in this bundle have been parcelled out, nothing exactly corresponding to the conventional meaning of property remains.

Various different groups—the workers themselves, the local municipality, and the society as a whole—have specific rights over the enterprise and its product. No one of these groups *owns* the enterprise, in the sense in which the capitalist owns it. This of course applies only to property in the *means of production*, that is, farming land, factories, machinery, and raw materials required for mass production. Our ordinary concept of ownership remains for private goods: umbrellas and wristwatches, radios and books.

Even in the sphere of consumption, however, a case can be made for a wider degree of communal ownership. I do not use all my property all the time. I could have access to a larger number of useful things if I were to pool my resources with a group of people, so that instead of my owning a camera and my neighbor's owning an aqualung, we shared them both. This would require a change in attitude to property, but it is the same change that is involved in workers' control. For workers' control replaces the attitude whereby I care only about what I personally own with an attitude of respect for the common material world that is the basis for my relations with other people. The latter attitude is obviously closer to the Christian

The Eye of the Needle

ideal. Once we learn to see people as more important than things, we learn also to see the things other people need as being as important as the things we need. We learn to love our neighbors as we love ourselves.

But what, it is asked, happens to motivation under such a system? Isn't private ownership the main factor that motivates people to work? Isn't unequal reward necessary in order to release initiative, to stimulate people to work harder in order to benefit from the inequalities? This sort of argument as a defence of capitalism is based on three misunderstandings:

1. A misunderstanding of the nature of capitalist society, in which, after all, most people do not own the means of production, but nevertheless work. In fact there is no meaningful relation in capitalist society between one's actual work and contribution to society, and one's actual reward. Ownership itself, rather than work, is the major source of inequality of reward.
2. A misunderstanding of the nature of the alternative society, in which one of the objectives is to improve the living and working conditions of all people. I am not working for "society." I am working for myself, in that I know and understand that, in such a system, although I no longer have the one-in-a-million chance of becoming a millionaire, I am most likely to improve my position at solid and reasonable rate by ensuring that other pen-pie are also doing the same. I am faced with the choice between cooperative endeavor with certain but shared rewards, and capitalist competition with a slight chance of great wealth, but a much greater chance of remaining at the bottom in an unequal share-out. It is not too difficult for me to grasp the fact that I am more likely to benefit under the first system.

Furthermore, even within the society as envisaged there can be differences of incomes. The workers in each enterprise will set the wage rates, and they may introduce differentials for training and skill if they so wish. Even on the material level, there are motives for me, within this system.

3. Most fundamentally, it involves a misunderstanding of the nature of motivation. For even in our materialistic society not all actions are motivated by the desire for material gain. And in many other societies the desire for material gain plays a much less important role. People are motivated also by love, by the desire for prestige, by pride in their craftsmanship or ability, by a moral commitment to their fellows, by a desire to make sense out of their lives, by curiosity, and even sometimes by a belief in God. It is not only the promise of more that will make me aspire to being a factory manager. I may like taking responsibilities and using my mind to the full on difficult problems. I may wish to contribute to the development of my fellows. I may wish to enjoy prestige and the respect of my fellows. If these motives operate even in present society, with its tremendous socializing stress on the overriding importance of material goods, how much more will they operate in a participatory democracy. And for Christian thought it is impossible to believe that people are only or even mainly motivated by bread alone.

When considering the question of an alternative to capitalism we must beware of assuming that the only other possibility is the Soviet model of communism. Soviet society has done away with private ownership of the means of production. But this is not enough. For there are no political institutions in Soviet society that would enable the people to assert their control over the means of production. In a situation where there is no effective communication between leadership and people, the leaders have two alternatives: to withdraw into the pursuit of personal gain, or to use coercion to get the society moving. Both have been tried in the Soviet Union. The result is a large, inefficient, and undemocratic state bureaucracy.

The only real alternative is to ensure popular participation, based on workers' control, in a context of political freedom.

The Eye of the Needle

6. EDUCATION FOR FREEDOM

At this point I want to make a small excursion into the field of education, for four reasons:

The Eye of the Needle

1. Most thinking about education exhibits graphically the weaknesses of non-utopian, common sense thinking.
2. The educational system illustrates the relationship between structure, content, and socialization that we have seen in discussing participation. Just as the organizational structure of the factory socializes the worker in a particular way, so does the organized structure of the school.
3. The attitude to education in Africa is a prime example of cultural neo-colonialism, of the fascination of Africa with the western capitalist model.
4. We have valuable analyses of inequality and discrimination in our educational system that make important proposals for improving the system, but they seem to me to be inadequate as Christian approaches to education. They fail to analyze and challenge any values implicit in our educational system, with the exception of racism.

Western tradition has it: (a) that education is the process of imparting certain key facts to children; (b) that there is a certain sequence of such facts that the child must go through, expressed in the division of children into classes with barriers (examinations) between them; (c) That education takes place in special institutions, schools, and (d) that schools require a special authority structure, from principal through teacher to pupil, and the corollary of this authority structure, discipline and deference on the part of the child.

Within this framework there are, of course, wide differences of opinion. Which are the key facts? How exactly does one test whether the child is ready to pass from one level to the next? How many different kinds of schools should there be? How much discipline is necessary? But we never question or even notice the framework itself. We don't notice it because it does not occur to us that education could have any other framework. And so we do not ask the two vital questions:

What role does this structure itself play in the education process, and could there be some other kind of education process?

The four basic assumptions are in fact wrong. There is no body of key facts that have to be learned in some special order. What has to be learned is a particular way of thinking, the ability to analyze, to think critically, and to think creatively. And if there were a body of key facts children would not learn them in school. Adults know that they have forgotten nearly every "fact" learned at school, and yet they all on believe religiously (or idolatrously) in school. The facts have been forgotten because they were never learned. They did not become a meaningful part of the child's world. They were part of a competition played between child and teacher, tokens to be thrown away after use in exams.

Perhaps the only important skills to come out of school are the abilities to read and write. Yet being acquired in school vitiates even these. For both have become specifically "school" things. They are not part of one's life, essential media for communicating with the world and with other people. Children spend years writing compositions about "My Favorite Pet," containing three metaphors and a simile—and remember, spelling and punctuation count. They learn how to please teacher, how to hide their own emotions and interests behind plastic phrases for putative examiners. They learn how to read the grey cardboard prose of the children's readers and textbooks and leap straight from there into the incomprehensibility of the "classics". Those who learn to love reading do so at home, not at school.

At the end of their school careers they know a few simple falsities: That somewhere there are "the facts ready to be *given* to one, rather than discovered. That the world is full of authority figures, but that these are relatively inefficient and can usually be got around. That studying is not a part of life. That they are

The Eye of the Needle

educated." That some people make it, but most fail. And if they have failed they have already learned that they are failures. Speaking of Latin America, Ivan Illich writes, "The majority is already hooked on school, that is, they are schooled in a sense of inferiority towards the better schooled. Their fanaticism in favor of school makes possible to exploit them doubly: it permits increasing allocation of public funds for the education of a few, increasing acceptance by the many of social control".

This state of affairs cannot be remedied by spending more money on education or by changing the syllabus. It is a result not of the content of the education system but of its structure. The concept of "the school" separate from society and teaching "the facts" in a regular progression simply goes against the normal methods of learning. Children are placed in this peculiar environment, and because it doesn't meet their needs, they have to be disciplined. This completes the vicious circle by isolating them even further from the teacher and from learning. The teacher, already the "fact authority becomes also the discipline authority". This places intolerable burdens on him or her. Since "the facts" are all known, the teacher can never admit to ignorance. Ignorance would be a weakness. The class must therefore be kept in familiar bounds; the teacher cannot risk opening out. As discipline authority figure, the teacher has always to be on edge "in case they go too far." Any openness would immediately risk "chaos." And it really would, for the pupils have long ago learned to see the teacher as an authority figure, rather than as somebody with whom one could possibly communicate. They have learned only two categories for teachers, efficient disciplinarians and inefficient disciplinarians. The teacher is bound down by this weight of role, expectation, and prejudgment.

Why are children placed in this peculiar environment? All societies have educational systems of some sort: specific ways in which children are taught the facts and values necessary for their social roles. In various societies this has been done by parents, by older children, in temporary "initiation schools," by specific relatives, and so on. There are a number of reasons for the particular form taken by the education system in Western Europe over the last few hundred years. One important reason is connected with the *custodial role* of the school, with the fact that one of the main jobs the school does is to look after the children while their parents are at work.

All the earlier methods of education had one thing in common: The child's education was essentially part of the life-process of the community. But this was possible only when the community had a unified and communal life process. With the onset of industrial capitalism this ceased to be the case: (1) The work sphere and the living sphere were separated; (2) work became work for another person. While work was still done for the family or for the village, it was possible for the children to take part in the work to the level of their capacity. The work was meaningful to their group, and the group's personal relationships with the children ensured that working would not involve mistreatment or overwork. But once work became work for another in the impersonal and rigidly structured milieu of the factory all this no longer applied. Children could not work without being exploited. The socially disjointed life of the new industrial towns was no substitute for the communal life of the village. The children could neither accompany their parents to work nor stay at home without them. The custodial school became necessary. Furthermore the school had to socialize the child for its society, a hierarchical society of little pleasure and much pain. Thus the school as a separate institution was made necessary by a breakdown in the life of the community.

The disciplinary structure of the school still bears marks of that breakdown. A central aspect of people's social being is the way in which they think about and behave toward rules, whether they be those of the family or of the school or the values and laws of the wider society. We need to investigate how the individual becomes "self-disciplined" and what relation this has to the discipline practiced in schools. There are good reasons to believe that in fact school discipline discourages the development of self-discipline.

In his survey of our present knowledge of the socialization process, Kurt Danziger points out that there is a close relationship between the way in which children experience control by other people and the way in

The Eye of the Needle

which they come to control themselves. He distinguishes between "direct methods of punishment," such as psychological punishment or deprivations like detentions, and "psychological" types of discipline involving persuasions and explanation. He writes, "What direct methods of discipline have in common is that they sensitise the child to the anticipation of punishment, they reinforce the child for attention to the potential punitive responses of others. On the other hand, psychological types of discipline expand the child's own cognitive resources for internalised control of its own behaviour by focussing attention on his intentions and on general principles of conduct" (*Socialisation* [Harmondsworth, Eng.: Penguin, 1971]). What this means is that a method of "disciplining" that lays stress on "rules for the sake of rules" and enforces these rules by punishment is likely to be very inefficient, or even negative, in teaching self-discipline. It teaches the child to look for ways of avoiding punishment. This may indirectly mean following rules, but it is more likely, given normal inefficiency of detection, to mean looking for ways of beating the system. "Discipline for discipline's sake" produces anti-social individuals. On the other hand, if the rules are reasonable, and the reasons are explained, they help the child to understand the relations between his or her own behavior and other people's needs, and to become internally self-disciplined rather than externally controlled. That is, many school rules are probably counter-productive, playing no role in developing self-control, and the necessity to enforce them by coercion inhibits the rest of the learning process.

There is a common objection to this sort of argument:

Although reason would be nicer, it won't work. Children have to be obliged to learn. This "carrot and stick" theory of learning, learning by social reinforcement, as Danziger points out, has been shown to be totally inadequate. Most learning occurs not through the use of reward and punishment, but through *observation and imitation*, that is, the child continually observes and imitates the behavior of others. The child is continually trying out new roles, or aspects of roles: role as male, role as bicycle-rider, and role as symbolic reasoner. This is the essence of the learning process.

The significance of this fact for moral development is that "the development of a self involves the taking over of roles, and hence the points of view, of others." This process Piaget calls "decentration"—the process whereby the individual moves from a view of the universe as having one centre—oneself—to a view of it as having many centres,

Reasoning with the child and explaining the consequences of his actions creates a different kind of parent-child role system than the habitual recourse to punishment. The fact that the parent does not exact retaliation for the consequences of the child's actions, but merely requires the child to adopt a certain point of view towards them, clearly implies a certain respect for the child's ability to take responsibility for his actions... If ratings of moral responsibility have been found to be correlated with such features of family life as confidence-sharing awarding responsibility to the child, and sharing in family decisions, this is presumably due to the role-taking opportunities which these factors imply for the child.

Furthermore, "there is an observed positive correlation between the intellectual level and the level of moral judgement in children" and this is also a function of decentration and role taking. On the intellectual level decentration involves "the progressive replacement of a single, limited view of problems by the adoption of many points of view simultaneously," that is, the ability to synthesize many different aspects of a phenomenon to some sort of coherent whole. It is also linked with the capacity to think hypothetically, which is a crucial factor in intelligence.

To summarize, Danziger's survey of the current social psychology literature shows that the development of self-discipline and the development of intelligence are linked, and that both involve the development of the capacity to see things from many points of view. Further, it shows that the development of the capacity is inhibited by a particular form of external control that depends on authority and obedience. This means that

The Eye of the Needle

the child is likely to develop both morally and intellectually in an environment where there are no unnecessary restrictions, where the rules that do exist are necessary to the well-being of the children and are comprehensible to them, and where the education process depends essentially on the utilization of the role-taking and imitative propensities of children, rather than on external punishment and/or reward. Children naturally wish to expand the number of roles they can play and are strongly influenced in the roles they want to play by the adults around them, if the right relationships exist between them and those adults.

If the school is full of petty rules, incomprehensible to the pupils, a vicious circle of distrust, punishment, and hostility is set up. This directly stunts the moral and intellectual development of children by pushing them back into themselves and developing only their capacity to minimize punishment and indirectly destroys the possible basis of trust that would make possible learning other than "carrot and stick" learning.

How, then, can we design an educational system that will meet the above requirements, that will rely largely on the child's curiosity and desire to learn, and that will encourage in the child that kind of thinking which makes continuous self-education possible? There are at least two educational prerequisites: The child must go to "school" voluntarily, and the "teacher" must no longer be seen as "the one who knows," but rather as a helpful companion in a common search for truth. The school must be seen as a place which has resources that can be used when needed. We cannot return to the pre-industrial educational system, for there is now so much more to know that specialists are necessary. They need not, of course, all be concentrated in one place. As Ivan Illich has pointed out, many other places could, if one abandoned strictly economic criteria of efficiency, be turned into "learning environments." Workshops and offices could also be places where children go to learn, either as observers or as participants. In a worker-controlled democracy, children could be gradually integrated into the work process in a non-exploitative way at a much earlier age than they are now. And the combination of work and education could continue long past school-leaving age."

But the "school" would still be an important community centre where: (1) children could come together to play, learn, or work; (2) there would be facilities such as books, telescopes, laboratories, and animals, which would stimulate interest and be available for use; and (3) there would be people available for consultation, who could give advice on specific problems and offer courses on certain technical matters. Not all learning is easy. Children interested in space rockets are quickly going to discover that they need to know some mathematics and some physics. But once these are learned with a motive, the enormous excitement of coming to grasp basic principles will help to offset the difficulty of the task. And the idea that people naturally shy away from hard work is a myth. People shy away from meaningless work. But hard, directed, motivated work, even it includes elements that in them are dull and uninteresting, is one of the most satisfying and pleasurable of human activities. Compare the athlete training of our long-distance race with the convict forced to run on the spot for hours on end as punishment.

The problems of our schools are the problems of our society, and education cannot be turned into a liberating experience until our society makes room for free people. Nevertheless, education is one sphere in which we can at least make beginnings. We cannot introduce the education system I have just outlined above in a capitalist society. But we can move toward it, even in South Africa.

This is particularly important for black South Africans, since the one concrete advantage of separate development" is that it has placed or will place education in the control of the various homeland governments and representative bodies. It has not placed the financing education in their hands, so while they remain fascinated by the "white" model of education they will be condemned to be very poor imitations of a very inadequate original. However, if the "white" model is rejected, it will be possible, even with the very limited finances, to provide a much better and more liberating education.

In Africa, Julius Nyerere has done much to criticize and reject and replace the "white" model. In his

The Eye of the Needle

Education for Self-Reliance he has sketched out the way in which education tied to the communal problems of agriculture could help children to build a complex worldview through helping them see and solve problems as they arise in daily experience.

He writes that colonial education was motivated by a desire to inculcate the values of the colonial society and to train individuals for the service of the colonial state... [to satisfy] the need for local clerks and junior officials.... [It was] modelled on the British system but with unit- even heavier emphasis on subservient attitudes and on white-collar skills. Inevitably, too, it was based on the assumptions of a colonialist capitalist society. It emphasised and encouraged the individualistic instincts of mankind, instead of his co-operative instincts. It led to the possession of individual material wealth being the major criterion of social merit and worth.

Nyerere argues that this form of education is basically elitist, that it divorces people from the society it is supposed to be preparing them for, that it teaches that all knowledge which is worthwhile is acquired from books or from "educated people," and that it takes some of the healthiest and strongest young men and women out of productive work. Instead he suggests a school with its own farm, run by the children, where their formal teaching based on the technical understanding of agriculture, and on the social and financial problems which arise out of the communal running of the farm. The students should make as many of the decisions as possible: "The whole school should join in the programming of a year's work, and the breakdown of responsibility and timing within the overall plan." Here the children discover the necessity of learning to read and write, of learning arithmetic, of learning about people and how they interact, from a situation in which they are actually involved. This is not an education to prepare children to be "hewers of wood and drawers of water." It is an education in which "academic" skills are integrated with meaningful work and responsible participation in community self-government.

7. PARTICIPATORY DEMOCRACY FOR SOUTH AFRICA

South Africa is an unequal society. The inequalities are the result of the skilful use of power in their own interests by whites, who acted thus because they had internalized the capitalist human model, a model incompatible with Christianity.

Political and economic power is concentrated in white hands. The result is a situation in which merely removing the apartheid brakes on mobility and ending racial discrimination will not fundamentally alter the position of the black people of South Africa. A real change can be brought about only by a fundamental redistribution of wealth and of power.

These two factors cannot but be associated. A fundamental redistribution of wealth will require, first, a massive and rapid redistribution of resources to remedy the social disadvantages of the blacks: large-scale investment in schooling, housing, and public health schemes. The gap between white and black in respect to these basic needs is so great that such a scheme will require the substitution of a planned economy for a free-market economy. In a just society whites cannot hope to retain their present standard of living.

Second, economic power cannot be dissociated from ownership. A redressing of the imbalance in property ownership between white and black could also only occur through public intervention. Although land could be redistributed among the black peasantry, industry cannot be redistributed. Black "ownership" can come about only if private (white) ownership is replaced by (black) public control. That is, for ownership to change hands, public, political power must also change hands.

The Eye of the Needle

Universal suffrage is a prerequisite for a just society. It will certainly seem odd to most people, including most South Africans, actually to have to produce arguments for universal suffrage. But nevertheless it is worth looking into the arguments, as most white South Africans have not understood them. Neither of the main white political parties makes much pretence that their franchise policy is aimed at anything other than white dominance. The Progressive Party, however, has more universalistic aims. Nevertheless, it wishes to have, in international terms, a highly restricted franchise based on a combination of education and income qualifications. PP spokesmen that under these limitations about 15 percent of the electorate would initially be black have claimed it. That is, over 70 percent of the population would remain voteless. Two arguments are advanced for adopting this position: (1) a tactical argument: The white electorate is not likely to accept anything more radical than this; (2) an argument from principle: Individuals can exercise the vote in a responsible manner only if they have been educated. We will ignore the first argument. The second argument rests on a misunderstanding about the nature of politics, and a misunderstanding about the nature of education.

It is assumed that there are (1) a definable common good, (2) discoverable non-political technique realizing that good, and (3) a common aim on the part of all citizens to find that good. It follows from this that politics should be left to those best qualified for the discovering the good and these techniques. But this is nonsense.

The "common good" cannot be defined or discovered unless people have some public means of expressing their needs, desires, and perceptions of reality. The techniques for achieving this good include political techniques, as we have seen from our analysis of participation. And, most important of all, the idea that each citizen wills the common good is a sociological naiveté of the first order. By this I do not mean that people are necessarily selfish, although they very often are. But even unselfish people tend to perceive society's needs, and other people's needs, from a specific and limited point of view. There is a conflict of interest as well as a conflict of perspectives between various groups. Franchise proposals that limit the vote to certain groups result in those groups legislating, consciously or unconsciously, in their own interests. Politics is not the abstract universal search for a common good. It is the process of synthesizing a variety of interests within a common policy, and only those interests which appear in the political process get included in the final policy.

The Progressive Party seems to suffer from some sort of schizophrenia here. On the one hand, its spokesmen argue convincingly that South Africa is an inherently unstable society because the blacks have no institutionalized ways of expressing their grievances and interests, and are therefore likely to express them in uninstitutionalized ways such as riots, violence, and subversion." But they then offer a policy that will still leave 70 percent of the population in the same voiceless position. They seem to believe at one and the same time "that those blacks who are enfranchised will act as spokesmen for the others, and also that they will join with the whites in forming a "stable middle-class," that those that they will represent represent class interests rather than race interests. A cynic might argue that the real objective of the Progressive Party policy is to do just this, to co-opt the most articulate and successful blacks into the white groups so as to deprive the black people of one of their most likely sources of effective, change-oriented leadership. However, given their own clear warning the dangers of leaving the black people politically voiceless, it is probable that this interpretation is an over simplification. It is more likely that they are simply confused, partly by the difficulties of escaping from their own middle-class, white perspectives and partly by the difficulties of working within all-white political institutions.

The misunderstanding about the nature of education involves the beliefs (1) that there is some relationship between the formal education received in South Africa schools and the formation of political competence, and (2) that formal education is the only kind of meaningful social learning process. Both these implicit assumptions need only to be stated to be recognized as absurd. Most of the facts people know about their society are not learned in school. The process of education involves much more than simple, formal learning.

The Eye of the Needle

Literacy is, of course, of some importance, but its importance has been exaggerated. Most literates do not read the political sections of the newspapers anyway, and illiterates have other important sources of information, through radio and television, and also by word of mouth.

There is, therefore, no justification for restricting suffrage either to the wealthy or to the educated, two groups which, in any event, roughly coincide in an unequal society. Universal suffrage is a necessary condition both for political justice and for political stability. But it is not a sufficient condition. There are still problems both of justice and of stability even with universal franchise. I have already shown that if other political resources are unequally distributed the equalizing effect of the franchise may be offset. We now need to look at the social preconditions for political stability. There are two basic conditions: (1) there should be no sharp division into social groups with contradictory interests in a number of different spheres. (2) The citizen should be adequately integrated into the political system; they should be capable of operating the political system and should recognize it as the major means of solving social problems.

In South Africa the major cause of conflict is the unequal distribution of wealth. This unequal distribution coincides almost exactly with color or race differences, and, somewhat more roughly, with cultural differences. Neither cultural nor racial differences are in themselves inherently causes of social conflict, although they can, through ignorance and prejudice, become causes of conflict. In South Africa, this basic cause of social conflict and tension is overlaid by race and cultural prejudice in a potent mixture. Prejudice can be cured by education. Contradiction of interest cannot. However, if the wealth gap is done away with, there will no longer be any inherent reason for conflict. Cultural or racial groups can and do co-exist when they are not also divided by different economic interests. The maintenance of their cultural identity by white South Africans is a reasonable wish, but it is not dependent on their maintenance of economic privilege, and should not be confused with this.

How can the citizen be integrated into the political system? We have seen that the vote does not of itself do this. If I merely vote once every five years I have no meaningful control over decision-making. I am not involved in politics between elections and therefore do not acquire the knowledge on which to base my decisions. The structural political relationships are much more important than is formal education in determining Political knowledge. Nor am I in any position to prevent various organizational oligarchies from arising. There is a danger that the very political parties established to provide for mass political participation will become such oligarchies. The leadership controls the financial and communications resources and is in a position to use these resources in bidding for personal power, rather than to ensure popular involvement. Once this happens individuals, faced with steamroller political vote collecting machines over which they have no control become even further alienated from the political process.

In this situation of popular alienation from the political institutions we get a condition that has been described as "the mass society." One sociologist has defined the mass society as follows:

...an agglomeration of individuals socially isolated but not physically isolated from one another. They are subjected to same influences, especially those of propaganda, but because of social isolation have no opportunity for the rational discussion of these influences. They are thus moulded by these influences—all pretty much in the same way—without having any independent individual reactions. Also, because of social isolation, the individuals in a mass society are lonely and need belong to some group movement. They are without loyalties and are weak on ideals, but desire both—at least unconsciously (Arnold Rose, *The Power Structure* [New York Oxford University Press, 1967]).

Individuals in this situation of social isolation, or atomization, come into frequent contact with one another, but have no organized relationship with one people in pursuit of a common goal. Because their relationships with other people are so fragmented, they see society as a whole as strange and incomprehensible as a set of

The Eye of the Needle

disconnected pressures to which they have to submit. Materially and psychologically frustrate wanting to belong with other people but continually being forced apart from them again, their only social outlet is likely to be in sudden and irrational acts that provide a release for their frustration and the satisfaction of at least temporary total identification with the crowd: rioting, lynch-gangs, and similar "mob actions" are characteristic of the mass society. The alternative to mob action is the apathy of total withdrawal into self, an apathy which, being based on social frustrations, is inherently unstable and can turn back into mass violence.

Unless a society provides a rich variety of intermediate institutions between the individual and the government, it is likely to be both oligarchical and inherently unstable. The case of many independent African states illustrates this. These states tend to lack intermediate institutions between the old village community and the new central government. Because most of the economy is at subsistence level, there are not even economic institutions linking the capital city to the countryside. As a result, "politics" becomes limited to the capital city. In the city there are a large mass of disorganized, disoriented, unemployed or semi-employed individuals who have left the tribal rural areas and are not yet either socially or economically integrated into the city. Facing them is a small number of elite groups—particularly the bureaucracy and the military—which sometimes compete and sometimes collaborate. The city mass may be used as an occasional tool by one of these groups against the other, but essentially "politics" becomes a struggle among the elite for the spoils of office, with no mass involvement, and no way in which the people can check corruption and exploitation. As a contrast to this pattern, Tanzania has a Political structure which, through the Ujamaa villages and the existence of an organized mass party, can integrate both the peasantry and the city-dweller into the national political process.

The above analyses indicate that there are two main causes of political instability: gross social inequalities, and the absence of institutions effectively integrating the individual into the social decision-making process. It is necessary to point out that South Africa has both qualities in abundance.

The effect of participatory democracy is to do away with both these evils. It will do away with the main cause of race conflict by abolishing social inequalities based on race, and it will provide the range of institutions that will integrate the individuals into society and will enable them, through the practical education of participation, to understand in the quickest and most thorough way possible how society works.

To summarize, in South Africa participatory democracy would involve, first, the replacement of private ownership of the means of production by workers control in industry and in agriculture. By "worker", be it noted, is meant every individual who plays a part in the production process, from manager to cleaner. Group discussion of industrial management on a basis of equality between all these would provide the quickest way of passing managerial skills down to workers. The stereotype of the ignorant black worker is false. Most black workers who have spent a considerable time in an industry know enough to look after its day-to-day running. What they do not know is what has been kept from them, not what they are incapable of knowing: the details of the commercial network linking the factory to the rest of society and some of the more refined technological details connected with basic maintenance and long-term planning. But those who do have the skills, under the political supervisions, could do elected Workers' Councils. Initially, the bulk of the workers would probably be more concerned with wages and their own welfare, but through participation they would gradually develop the capacity to handle the more technical problems. A large-scale adult education program communicating technical skills and explaining the operation of society would give a strong boost to this managerial personnel would work for three months of the year on the factory floor, to ensure that they became acquainted as rapidly as possible with the "workers perspectives and problems.

Naturally there would be no compensation paid to the previous owners, since their control of the means of production is, as we have seen, a function either of inheritance or their personal skill in exploiting others neither of which, in terms of the Christian human model are deserving of reward. But of course, people like

The Eye of the Needle

financers, stockbrokers, property speculators, advertising executives, and absentee farm owners should be given assistance in using their undoubted skills in adjusting to a life of productive labor.

Second in South Africa participatory democracy, workers' control of industry and agriculture would occur within the context of a political system based on universal franchise and maximum decentralization, with real powers being given to local and to provincial authorities. At each level there should be a close relationship between bodies elected on the normal constituency basis and bodies elected on an enterprise basis. This would help to integrate the common and the particular interest. The central government would keep a balance between the various regional interests, and would perform the planning functions outlined in Chapter 5.

The object of this scheme is not to tell people what they want, or what they ought to want. It gives individuals the maximum possible amount of control over what happens to themselves and hence the maximum possible amount of freedom to decide what they want, and then to act to get it. Its object is to free the individual both from the direct power of others and from the power of hidden social forces. It is not a choice, but a framework within which choice becomes possible.

It is relatively easy to sketch out the above picture of an ideal possible society in South Africa. It is, I must stress, a possible society, in that there are neither imperatives of organization nor imperatives of human nature which would prevent such a society from operating once it came into existence. Moreover, it is the only form of society that would be compatible with the Christian human model, in which human beings would be free both in them and for other people, in which love and real communication would not be made impossible by prejudice, by hierarchies of authority and habits of obedience, or by relations of exploitation.

But the problem is how can we bring this society into existence? Perhaps the most important step in bringing something about is that of becoming aware that it *could exist*. And probably all I can hope to do here is to convince you of this.

However, it is necessary at least to look at some of the problems involved in bringing about change. If we return to what was said earlier about socialization, it becomes clear that there is a vicious circle involved. For the effect of the socialization process is to shape individuals to the needs of the particular social system, to train them to want what the society can give them, and to expect what is likely to happen to them. This tendency for the socialization process to narrow potentialities into one limited human model was at the basis of the whole social analysis of chapter 2, and hence of the criticism of capitalist society and of the suggestion of an alternative. But if individuals are in a very real sense created by the society for its needs, who is going to change society?

The answer is two-fold.

First, the socialization process is never entirely successful. Every individual's experience is in some way unique, and in this uniqueness lies the possibility that the socialization process may fail.

Second, the problems created for the individuals by the particular internal dynamic of the society may be such as to push them in new directions of thoughts action. An obvious example of this was the growth of the trade union movement in Western Europe. Although the socialization process of capitalist society push the direction of obedience to authority and competition with one's equals, nevertheless the pressures and conflicts within the factory pushed the workers in the opposite direction, in the direction of solidarity with their fellows and of rebellion against their masters. Once this tradition was established, there then existed also a new socializing agency encouraging ways of behaving which were opposed to the social structure.

The Eye of the Needle

There is an intimate relationship between change in consciousness and organization. Consciousness develops along with organization. To be effective, organization must be related to the way in which people see the world and must help them to see the world in a new way. There are three essential elements in this new way of seeing the world. I must come to see the world as able to be changed. I must come to see myself as having the capacity to play a part in changing it. And I must see that my capacity to do this can be realized only in cooperation with other people. To grasp these three facts involves a fundamental shift in psychological attitude toward the world, rather than a simple change of intellectual awareness. Such a shift only occurs once I find myself involved in action.

In a situation of oppression, most people see the social order as being part of the natural order of things. They may very well hate it, but it does not occur to them that it could be changed, any more than could the seasons. "They experience themselves as powerless, as being sublet to the operation of external forces, rather than as being independent centers of action. And, in addition, the tensions and scarcities involved in such a life often lead them to distrust their neighbors. Only if organization begins from the immediate problems that I experience in my everyday life can I begin to learn in practice that the world can be changed, that I can change it, and that to do it with my neighbor. The process of political change through the development of organizational solidarity must itself be a participatory experience if people are to become conscious of the possibilities of freedom.

In South Africa there are a number of possibilities connected with the two ways in which the conservatives effect of socialization may fail.

1. There is still in existence an effective "counterculture," embodying communal and person-oriented values incompatible with the values of the dominant, capitalist culture. This is the culture of tribal society, which was essentially communal and egalitarian. The work unit and the social unit coincided. Work was communally organized. There was a recognized responsibility for mutual aid. Land was tribally owned, and so it was not possible for a class of landless poor to emerge. In du Rand's striking phrase, men at work were "men-in community," rather than "men-in-competition." Political and administrative decisions were taken by the tribe or at least the adult males of the tribe as a whole, through a process of discussion and consensus. The chief or headman did not issue commands. He had no greater official status than any other individual in the process of discussion. His special role was simply to give formal expression to an agreement that had already been reached.

It is obvious that this tribal structure has not survived totally intact. For the migrant laborer the work unit and the social unit no longer coincide. They are obliged, though du Rand suggests still often against their will, to become "men-in-competition." They are subject to the socialization process that places those who possess more goods above solidarity with one's fellows. It is equally obvious that even if the tribal culture did survive in its entirety it would not of itself be adequate for the needs of a fairly complex industrial society. Its small clan and tribal units would have to be integrated into the wider society, and so wider loyalties would have to be developed. But nevertheless the tribal culture has not been totally destroyed, and it provides the basis for a communal ethic of human solidarity. Particularly in agriculture the tribal-type unit could easily be used as the basis for cooperative farming, benefiting both from the advantage of working with large units and at the same time doing away with the vast class of landless poor who make up the bulk of the population of the large-scale farming areas.

The forthcoming independence of the "homelands" will of itself bring about no meaningful change in South Africa's power imbalance. Black workers will still create wealth in white-controlled areas for whites. Both their problems and the financial means for solving these Problems will be in the white-controlled areas, beyond the Jurisdiction of the "homeland" governments. But there is one creative role the "homelands" could play. "By developing examples of communal work, through worker-controlled agricultural cooperatives,

The Eye of the Needle

through "credit unions, and through communal education schemes, they could show the continuing possibility of work as "men-in-community," develop communal solidarity and encourage the growth of organizational skills. By integrating agricultural work with small-scale intermediate technology industry they could also indicate the possibility of a move away from the highly centralized capitalist model of industrialization in the direction of a model of industrialization which, placing a greater emphasis on all-round human needs than on crude criteria of economic efficiency, would introduce the increase in productivity brought about by technology without too great a destruction of the social fabric and without the environmental disasters of the great cities.

2. The growth of the concept "black consciousness" among students and intellectuals indicates an important breakdown of the socialization process. The black [South African Student Organisation](#) (SASO) states in its manifesto that "the basic tenet of [Black Consciousness](#) is that the Blackman must reject all value systems that seek to make him a foreigner in the country of his birth and reduce his basic human dignity. The Blackman must build up his own value systems, see himself as self-defined and not as defined by others." This statement recognizes that what is needed is not the "assimilation of blacks into an already established set of norms drawn up and motivated by white society," but rather the creation of a new type of society embodying new values.

What are those new values to be? So far, proponents of black consciousness have not spelled this out in any detail. They have stressed the fact that being black has its own virtues, and this is an important point to make a world in which "black" is associated with evil and "white" with good. But being black is not a political program. Several SASO leaders have referred with approval to Leopold Senghor's concept of "Negritude". It is illuminating to analyze the role that this and similar concepts played in the struggle for independence in Africa in the 1950s. For at least some of Africa's problems today have their roots in the nature of the independence political struggle, in the type of organization, and in the ideology of that struggle.

The pre-independence political movements had an essentially negative orientation. Their objective was to push out the colonial rulers, and they mobilized people with slogans and principles geared to this end. Although some of the leaders theorized about postcolonial problems, there was rarely any attempt to build a positive mass movement that could not only push the imperialists out but also provide the basis for a society. As a result, most of the political parties separated after independence, leaving a leadership that could neither mobilize the people for further change nor be kept in check by the people. We saw some of the consequences of this in an earlier chapter.

The role played by "Negritude" in this process was an ambiguous one. Its central orientation—black is as good as, if not better than, white—helped to articulate the idea of independence and to mobilize the people against foreign domination. But the very stress on blackness helped to obscure certain problems of post-independence society. In particular it implied that the common interest that united all the people against colonialism would continue after independence. It tended to idealize the egalitarian tribal past, and thus obscure the fact that colonization had brought class differentiation to Africa. Even Julius Nyerere could write in 1962 "the idea of 'class' or 'caste' was non-existent in African society" (Freedom and Unity [Dar es Salaam: Oxford, 1966], p. 170). But by the end of the decade he was writing that Tanzania "still contains elements of feudalism and capitalism—with their temptations. These feudalistic and capitalistic features of our society could spread and entrench themselves" (Freedom and Socialism [Dar es Salaam: Oxford, 1968], p. 233). He pointed out that "had we continued along the road to capitalism the members of our Civil Service, Local Government Service, our Army and Police, our doctors, auditors and administrators, and so on, might well have been among the privileged class of Tanzanians." And he reassessed the independence struggle:

"My leaders of the independence struggle . . . were not against capitalism; they simply wanted its fruits, and

The Eye of the Needle

saw independence as the means to that end. Indeed, many of the most active fighters in the independence movement were Motivated— consciously or unconsciously—by the belief that only with independence could they attain that ideal of individual which their education or their experience in the modern actor had established as a worthwhile goal. . . This lack of ideological content during the independence struggle often served to maintain unity among the anti-colonist forces, or to prevent a diversion of energies into the difficult question of socialist education. (It was not only selfishness which made the leaders think only in terms of Africanizing the capitalist economy of the colonialists; often they had no knowledge of any alternatives.) But it can present a serious problem in the "dependence period (ibid. pp. 27-28).

In South Africa there are certain overriding interests that all blacks have in common. They are all politically powerless and they all suffer from racial discrimination. But there are also potential conflicts of perspective and of interest. Coloureds and Indians have on the average a slightly higher standard of living than do Africans, and this is connected with a relatively favored position in regard to education, job opportunities, and trade unions rights. They are gradually moving into more and more skilled industrial and lower grade white-collar jobs. To the extent that they are motivated by purely material values, they may well be tempted to react to Africans as threatening competitors for skilled jobs, rather than as potential allies against white supremacy. Similarly, at least some members of the slowly growing African middle class may decide that they have more to gain from the limited certainties of the status quo than from the perhaps unlimited uncertainties of change. And by its very existence such a class at least seems to offer the possibility of salvation by individual upward mobility, thus discouraging attempts at group mobility. Finally, within the Bantustans there exists the possibility of a clash of interests between the peasantry and a "middle class" of traders, politicians, and civil servants.

Thus an assertion of the dignity of blackness is not enough. It must be accompanied by an analysis of the conflicts of interest among the black people and by positive orientation toward a future society. And it is necessary that this should include a specific rejection of the materialist values of capitalist society. For in South Africa it is the acceptance of such values that is the most potent threat to the unity of the black people.

3. The very difficulties experienced by Africans, bound by the pass laws and low wages, in integrating themselves into the industrial system may discourage them from internalizing the consumer values of industrial society. As in nineteenth-century Europe, it is likely that, despite legislation, trade union activity will develop and the black urban workers will discover the communal solidarity of class organization. The striking Ovambo workers in South West Africa have recently shown the potency of this mixture of worker and tribal solidarity.

4. Finally, there are even some counter-socializing forces operating among the whites, and it is vital to understand these. We have seen that the main motive for white dominance is material self-interest. But we have also seen that acting in terms of one's material self-interest is not a necessary result of "human nature". It is the result of having internalized a particular human model. The whites are, in an important sense themselves victims of the very system that they fight to preserve. For in becoming racialists and exploiters they become closed off to important areas of human experience. We have already discussed in general terms what is meant by the injunction "love your neighbor as yourself", you must love your neighbor. The question is what do you become if you fear and hate your neighbor? The essential thing that white South Africans lose is openness to the future and to others.

To maintain political control of South Africa a certain type of government is required, and it is impossible to separate completely what it must do to blacks from what it does to whites. A minority cannot rule a majority by consent and therefore must be prepared to use force to maintain this and this in turn requires a cultural climate that sanctions killing. It must be continually on "subversion" and be prepared to react to it rapidly. This requires a centralized authoritarian governmental system and an organization to discover subversion a

The Eye of the Needle

secret spy service. The secret police are the creation of the National Party. They are the creation of white supremacy.

The spies must inevitably be among the whites as well as the blacks, for dissent anywhere may be contagious, and hence fatal. A climate develops in which people who are not even white dissenters fear to speak of politics or openly to criticize government policy. In many people's minds government policy and law become synonymous. We end up with the absurd picture of white cricket officials refusing to make any comment about multiracial sport because it is "against government policy." Thus the political cost to whites of maintaining economic privilege is that they lose control over many other areas of their lives and become subject to an external authority. Of course, to the extent that they have accepted the overriding importance of wealth they do not notice what they must give up to maintain it. The political fear and loss of freedom is accompanied by an even more insidious cultural unfreedom. Psychologically insecure individuals are threatened by change. They turn in upon themselves, blindly assert their importance, their own identity and their own cultural traditions, but are not capable of opening themselves out toward the future. They are incapable of using the cultural tradition as a basis for creative thought, rather than as an excuse for repetition of the past. Race prejudice prevents intelligent thought about the nature and functioning of society. And where intelligent thought is not available as a possible way of handling change, the only recourse is to authority. It maybe to the authority of specific individuals, or of a particular tradition, or of a religion that has lost its transcendence. The authoritarian structure of the education system with its stress on discipline and on fact learning is not a mere coincidence.

We have seen that love requires understanding of oneself and of the other. But it is not possible to understand myself or the other without the use of reason, without thinking about myself and my society. Unless I can see the way in which social forces impinge upon me and structure my relationships with other people I cannot escape from mere role-playing, from patterned responses to the other. The stereotypical reaction of white to black is only the most obvious expression of society in which all relationships, from courtship to commuting, become stereotyped. All relations become rituals. The paradigm for human relationships in white South Africa is the tea party in which the white ladies coo properly over the maid's cakes and circulate pre-digested opinions about "the servant problem." Not an idea not a moment of communication, troubles the smooth, empty atmosphere.

The excitement of self-discovery, the excitement of shattered certainties, and the thrill of freedom: These are experiences that are closed to white South Africans. The price of control is conformity.

But these patterns can be broken. And it is important to try to break them. It is important to show the whites they have to gain from a free democratic society. Once cultural preservation and development becomes free from the preservation of privilege it becomes possible to visualize a society in which cultural identity does not imply exclusivity and fear.

Until white South Africans come to understand that Present society and their present position is a result not of their own virtues but of their vices; until they come to see world history over the last five hundred years not as the "triumph of white civilization," but simply as the bloody and ambiguous birth of a new technology, and until they come to see these things not in the past but in hope for the future, they will not be able to communicate with black people, nor, ultimately, with one another.

The major force that could work in such a direction is the church. If the Christian churches can rediscover their transcendence and show the meaning of love to white South Africans, then a peaceful resolution of the struggle will be possible.

The Eye of the Needle

Within and without the church, we can all work for change in South Africa in the following ways:

First, on the personal level we all need to learn to live in a way that embodies our preference for people over things. We must realize that love and truth are more important than possessions. We must do this to be human. We must also do it because, in South Africa, our own attachment to possessions makes us vulnerable to intimidation. What we are afraid of determined by what we value. If we love people we will when faced by intimidation, fear the loss of our openness toward other people more than we fear anything the intimidators can do to us.

We can learn to live differently as individuals, and we can also learn to live differently in small groups by experimenting with types of communal living based on the sharing of property. Only if the new culture is embodied in the process of moving toward the new society will that society work when we get to it.

Second, on the cultural level we can try to propagate and develop the critique of the dominant South African values that I have attempted here. We must attack racism, but we must also attack the unquestioned acceptance of material values underlying racism. We must try to show to all those who accept the dominant values how much they lose in this society and how much they could gain in a good society, "Self-interest" and "material-interest" are not the same. In fact, they are often incompatible.

Most black South Africans probably have an awareness of this, but we are unlikely to convince the major of white South Africans who describe themselves as Christians that they should actually be Christians. Nevertheless, the attempt to do so is important, even only because it will weaken the obstacle to change constituted by white intransigence. Any attempt to educate people must start from their own experienced problems. The two most important areas in which whites actually recognize that they are experiencing problems as a sort of reification of human relationships are not connected with race at all. These are man-woman relationships and formal education. By helping whites articulate and understand their problems in these areas we can help them to understand the wider significance of the dehumanizing nature of authority structures, Predefined social roles, and inequality of all kinds.

Third, on the organizational level we must ensure that all organizations we work in do not prefigure the future. Organizations must be participatory rather than authoritarian. They must be areas in which people experience human solidarity and learn to work with one another in harmony and in love. The churches must be made into such organizations.

Workers' organizations are a crucial element in the development of solidarity and of power. The Bantustans, while they cannot possibly develop as autonomous and viable states, are nevertheless areas in which small-scale models of the future can be tried out in it cooperative agriculture, education, and industry.

The churches have large sums of money that they invest in various business enterprises. There is no reason why they should not invest some of this money in worker-controlled enterprises in the homelands or in urban areas. And, finally, there is no reason why Christian business people should not practice Christianity by handing their own enterprises over to the workers.

The Eye of the Needle

8. THE IMPRACTICALITY OF REALISM

The Christian human model is one of freedom and openness. To love means to be free and open to other people. Certain kinds of social institutions make people unfree in themselves by subjecting them to hidden conditioning mechanisms, and also make them unfree for other people, by setting up harmful power imbalances between people. Freedom for oneself and freedom with other people require certain kinds of social institution

Only in a participatory democracy can we both cooperate freely and openly with other people and at the same time maximize our own personal range of effect by choices. Only in a participatory democracy are we able to develop the psychological skills and the knowledge required for social action, to control the meaning of our work, to control those hidden social forces that place constraints on us in a capitalist society and to minimize the abuse of power that threatens in all organization life structures. The imperatives of organization we have come across require planning and a certain amount of decision-making hierarchy. But there are mechanisms that can be used to minimize the problems arising from this. Those "imperatives of human nature" that are usually advanced as arguments against the kind of society envisaged are, we have seen, the products, rather than the causes, of contemporary society. They cannot prevent the operating of the Utopian South African society I have described.

We must now finally return from "utopianism" to "all other things being equal" realism, to the argument that in fact all other things will remain equal: that the change in consciousness that would replace competing egotists by individuals seeking loving communication with their fellows will not occur; that therefore we must place all our hopes and articulate our strategies within the present social and political framework; that we must try to ensure simply that within a consumption-oriented capitalist society, the extremes of wealth and poverty do not grow too great.

The best way that I can demonstrate the practicality of my utopianism is by showing the impracticality of such "realism." Leaving aside the question of whether the continuation of the present is desirable, we must ask: Is the continuation of the present a possible future? The answer is that it is not. The stability of present capitalist society rests on growth. It requires growth because capitalism is intrinsically growth-oriented. It also requires growth because the only way that those at the bottom of what are still very unequal societies can be kept happy is by the promise that eventually, 'through continued economic growth, and if they don't rock the boat, they will get what those at the top are getting now. *But there are limits to growth:* And those limits are not in the far distant future. They are probably within our lifetimes, and certainly within the lifetimes of our children.

The limits to growth are twofold. There are limits to the physical resources of our planet. And there are limits to our ability to dispose of our own rubbish. If we continue to expand our production at the present rate without pollution control, then we shall suffocate our planet. If we do introduce widespread measures to minimize pollution these will increase considerably the capital cost of production and thereby will use up even more resources. Even leaving pollution aside, as the accessible mineral resources are used up so more old resources have to be used to discover and extract new resources in more and more inaccessible places. Neither "atomic energy" nor "science" is likely to solve these problems. The use of atomic energy requires a rare ore that is just as likely to be soon exhausted as are our more usual fossil fuels, coal and oil. Nuclear reactors also produce dangerous radioactive wastes that are very difficult to dispose of safely. "Science" may of course come up with some new technical solution to the problems of pollution and resources. But it is not likely to. And it would be highly unscientific to continue merrily along, on the assumption that "a new

The Eye of the Needle

invention” will appear as we reach the brink.

Unless we end our obsession with growth and reallocate the resources that we do have left to provide for our vital material needs—food, shelter, and health—we can look forward to a future of famine, growing inequality, social conflict, and universal hate and fear in the struggle for survival.

Population control is, of course, important; ultimately the world cannot sustain the present rate of population growth, even if we all live at survival level. But it is only part of the answer. For several decades past the United States, with 6 percent of the world's population, has been accounting for about 50 percent of the annual use of waste of resources. The average American consumes about much as twenty-five Indians. This is not a very good position from which to preach to the Indians about the dangerous pressure of population growth upon the world's resources. The United States economy drains off resources from all over the world and is, at the moment, by far the biggest single threat to our common heritage. Similarly in South Africa, the white minority, with an average income about twelve times as great as that of blacks, consumes far more of the country's resources than does the black majority. White consumption control would be a much more effective means of immediately protecting those resources than would black population control.

The argument against an unequal society and an unequal world is practical as well as moral. An unequal society is expensive. Resources are continuously wasted in control mechanisms. Those on the top have to have a hierarchy of control and a vast organizational bureaucracy to make sure those at the bottom are doing the work they are being paid to do. Those at the bottom are interested in their wages, not in their work. They waste physical resources and they waste their creative capacities.

Ultimately this wastage of human resources is even more serious than the waste of physical resources. As we have seen, the nature of the social structure and of the socialization processes in unequal societies is such that those at the bottom are stunted. Blacks in South Africa, workers in a capitalist society, women in a male-dominated society, all of these are deprived of their autonomy, of their ability to create, to innovate and to participate. What society has made of them is then produced as an argument for the necessity of the continued existence of that form of society.

A grossly unequal society is immoral at any time. In our time it is also stupid. We can no longer afford the waste of resources involved. We can no longer afford to stifle creativity, inhibit cooperation, and foster fierce and destructive competition for scarce goods.

We have no choice but to look for happiness not in things but in relationships with other people.

Meanwhile in South Africa, the whites are preparing to fight to the death for the right to own a second car.

They are arming themselves to kill people for more things. How practical is it to want a second car when the world is running out of petrol? How practical is it to try to pass a camel through the eye of a needle?

The Eye of the Needle

POSTSCRIPT - SOUTH AFRICA: THE PRESENT AS HISTORY

I have shown in *The Eye of the Needle* that a participatory socialist democracy is not impossible, in the sense that "the facts of human nature or the imperatives social organization do not make it impossible". Nevertheless, my essay remains, in one sense, pejoratively Utopian. I have not considered in any detail enormous problems of how to bring such a society into existence in South Africa.

In part, this was intentional. I wished to make a normal statement, to offer a yardstick in terms of which the present in South Africa and elsewhere can be judged. I think that such a moral point can validly be made by itself; but of course, it is made as an invitation to begin the process of trying to change the society in a particular direction. In this postscript, I shall approach that problem. I do not intend to attempt to lie down organizational strategy for bringing a participatory democracy into being in South Africa. The precondition for the formulation of such a strategy is an analysis of the dynamics of the society within which one wishes to act. It is that analysis that I shall attempt here.

ESTABLISHED INJUSTICE

South Africa is a highly unequal society in which a minority of the population enjoys immense privileges and rules the majority of the population very harshly. The population in 1970 was nearly 21.5 million. Of these, 15 million were Africans, 2 million were Coloured, over 600,000 were Indians, and only 3.75 million were whites. That is, the ruling white group makes up less than one-fifth of the population. The dominant group is highly visible, the effects of its dominance are highly visible, and there are virtually no crosscutting ties between whites and blacks that might alleviate conflict. The oppressed people in South Africa are not only poor and deprived of meaningful political rights; they are also subject to various forms of legislation that enormously inhibit their freedom of movement and result in their being subjected to continuous police surveillance.

The initial conquest left the African tribes with about 13 percent of the total land area. This area is overcrowded and cannot possibly support the population. As a result, most men have to go out into the urban areas to work for most of their lives. But the pass laws and the other laws controlling movements both make it extremely difficult for them to do this without going through a long bureaucratic process, and also in many, many cases, make it possible for them to take their families with them. This means that a high percentage of African families are almost permanently divided, with the husbands living for most of the year in the urban areas, which of course places enormous stress on the family system. In the year July 1969 to late 1970, over 600,000 Africans were prosecuted for fringing these laws.

Observing the situation, many commentators have concluded that the only possible result is a violent revolution, in which the small ruling minority is overthrown. Such a revolution has been predicted for years and has still failed to occur. In fact, not since white conquest was completed by the end of the nineteenth century has white rule even been shaken. The mass political organizations that grew up in the 1950s were crushed with ease. Any analysis of the dynamics of South African society must begin from the fact that it seems to be remarkably stable in spite of the gross inequalities.

Part of the answer to this conundrum lies in the military power of the whites. South Africa is a rapidly developing industrial society and its economic strength enables the dominant group to run an expensive and

The Eye of the Needle

fairly efficient apparatus of repression, including a regular army, a white citizens force, a large police force, and a large secret police. Very little of this power has ever had to be used; it is certain that militarily the white group could fight off challenges to its dominance of far greater magnitude than it has had yet to face. So far the wide range of oppressive legislation has been adequate to prevent any such threat from building up. But mentally the white public is kept in a continuous state of war-readiness and the English-language press and the opposition United Party is almost as diligent in this as are the government. The whites are prepared for a fight and probably would fight if they had to. With the balance of forces as it is at present, they would certainly win in any straight black-white civil war!

This means, *inter alia*, that even if one were morally willing to advocate an armed uprising to change South Africa, there would be overwhelming arguments against such a strategy.

But the fact of military and police power does not of itself account for the relative stability of the South Africa society. In most societies, physical coercion is used only in the last resort to maintain the prevailing pattern of inequality. There are many other mechanisms of control available. We need to investigate some of the more important of these mechanisms in South Africa. I shall consider three of the most important mechanisms: First, a ruling group can attempt to maintain control by developing a *legitimizing ideology*, which justifies its rule in the eyes of the ruled. Second, a ruling group can maintain control by *manipulating divisions* within the dominated masses in the society. Third, the ruling group can manipulate or take advantage of a variety of *displacement phenomena* whereby the dominated individuals displace their frustration and aggression onto objects other than the social system in which this frustration and aggression originate.

The first of these, the development of a legitimating ideology, is of relatively minor importance in South Africa. White South Africans legitimate their rule by reference first to racial superiority and second to the cultural superiority of what they describe as white civilization. It is probably true that some black people have been brought to accept the idea of their own inferiority. But is probable that the idea of racial inferiority is widely rejected among all or most black groups. ¹ The idea of cultural superiority is perhaps more ambivalent. As we shall see later, one of the roles of the education system in South Africa has been to imbue in many blacks some sort of concept of the innate superiority of so-called western civilization over their traditional cultures. To the extent that whites appear as the bearers of this western civilization, it may well be that this belief functions to legitimize continued white dominance.

MANIPULATION OF DIVISIONS

The second mechanism is the manipulation of division among the dominated group. There are many different ways in which black South Africans are divided among themselves. Of course many of these divisions are perhaps relatively unimportant, and none of these divisions is absolute. Nevertheless, each type of division at the very least poses a tactical problem to anybody working for change in South Africa. It is important, therefore, not to pretend that such divisions do not exist. I shall first give a brief summary of the most important divisions, and then consider the question of their salience in the political sphere.

Ethnic divisions. These are the most obvious divisions, although they are not necessarily the most important. First, there is a division between the majority African group, on the one hand, and the two minority groups, the Coloureds and the Indians, on the other hand. These groups are both culturally distinct and also experience the oppression of the apartheid society in slightly different ways. Discriminatory legislation does not affect the Indians and the Coloureds in exactly the same way as it affects Africans.

Coloureds and Indians are not subject to the pass laws and therefore have much greater freedom of movement, Indians do need a permit to travel between the provinces, but this neither restricts them in the

The Eye of the Needle

way in which Africans are restricted, nor is it enforced by continual and humiliating pass raids. Most important is the fact that both Indians and Coloureds can move about urban areas and find and change jobs much more easily.

In addition to their greater freedom of movement Coloureds and Indians also have better educational facilities, and virtually the same trade union rights as the whites. As a result, they have, on the average, better wages. (In spite of this, there are large numbers of Coloured and Indian unskilled workers working for the same wages as the African workers.)

On the whole, Coloureds and Indians are given better social facilities, have better housing, more medical services, and so on.

These differences in their objective situations provide the basis for possible differences of interest. In addition there is a considerable degree of racial prejudice between the groups. All surveys that have been under-taken show this to some degree. There is very little intermarriage between the groups, and not much social contact. The groups are obliged to live in different residential areas and have different school systems. Thus outside the work situation, there is no normal area of contact. There are also large cultural differences: Most Africans have some links with traditional African culture. South African Indians preserve a considerable amount of traditional Indian culture, and most are either Moslem or Hindu. The Coloured groups are largely westernized and have no language other than Afrikaans or English.

The second major set of ethnic divisions, although it is within the African population, lies between the various tribal groups. There is some evidence of negative stereotyping between these different tribal units. However this is probably no more significant than the traditional negative stereotype that the English are alleged to hold for the Scots. What is probably more important are determinant in this. In terms of the policy of separate development, tribal unit has its own legislature, based on the so-called homelands. The homelands are economically non-viable. Their legislatures are dependent on one way or another on white-controlled Parliament for most of their incomes. In addition, their citizens are all dependent in one or another on the white-controlled areas for their mores. The first point is a potential source of conflict between the groups. The white - controlled is willing to offer only a relatively small amount of money to these various legislatures. Under these circumstances, there is possibility of competition among them for resources. Such conflict could easily be encouraged and manipulated by the whites. It is difficult to say what the relation might be between conflicts of this type of leadership level and relations between members of the different tribes in contact with one another though some attempt is made to segregate Africans on a tribal basis in the urban locations and although members of certain tribes are more concentrated in some industrial areas than in others, there is nevertheless considerable amount of intermingling. So-called faction fights are a fairly frequent occurrence, but these are never between members of different major tribes rather they are between members of neighboring clans within the same tribe, and have causes different from ethnic prejudice.

Class divisions. Although the bulk of the three black groups—African, Coloured, and Indian—are either peasants or industrial workers, there is a process of class formation occurring within each group. Naturally this class formation is taking place in slightly different ways within each group, but there are sufficient similarities to justify generalizing. Within each group, there is growing up a rather heterogeneous "middle class." This "middle class" includes a small number of very wealthy businessmen, a much larger number of smaller traders, professional people such as teachers and nurses, a sprinkling of doctors and lawyers, and finally civil servants and politicians. There is not necessarily any community of economic interests within this group, but they are, to a certain extent, unified by a common lifestyle and by a precariousness of status, both in relation to the poor mass of blacks and in regard to the whites, whose educational achievements and standard of living they share, but whose status, within society as a whole, is denied to them. There are three

The Eye of the Needle

important points to be made about this class.

1. Although there is still a considerable mobility, this class is already, to some extent, self-perpetuating. There is a tendency to marry within the class, and the children of such marriages are much more likely to receive relatively high standards of education that is the skilled main condition of entrance.

2. The middle class inevitably has a somewhat different set of interests than do the mass of the workers and peasants. On the one hand, many of them are employed in various ways within the institutions of separate development. For example, African clerks in the Department of Bantu Affairs play an important role in the day-to-day administration of the enormous variety of regulations that apply to Africans. Because of this, they have considerable power over the lives of individuals and therefore not only status but also the possibility of wealth through corruption. Government appointed chiefs and politicians similarly derive status and income from their positions. Businessmen are severely retarded in many ways, but, on the other hand, their businesses within the black residential areas are protected from competition from the much more powerful white-owned businesses (although this is less of an advantage for the Indian businessmen, whose businesses have large white and African clientele). Within the African group, there is developing, partly as a result of government policy, a link between city and rural trades; and this development, in turn, fosters further ties between city business and other members of the rural elite.

Opposed to these advantages, which may be seen to accrue as a result of aspects of separate development there are also particular disadvantages that affect this middle class more than they affect the rest. Because members of the middle class are more similar to the whites in lifestyle, the middle class are more offended by discriminatory treatment of all kinds. They are also the people who are often doing the same jobs as whites, but are earning much lower salaries. On the other hand, this makes them even more acutely aware of the injustice of the system, but, on the hand, it poses to them a different problem from that faced by the underpaid unskilled laborer. The teacher or the nurse or doctor wants equal pay for equal work, which means that they want to join the privileged white elite. The interests of the workers lie in the drastic alteration of the entire wage system, since within the present system; they can never aspire to a decent living.

3. Thus we can see that members of the middle class are likely to experience the injustices of apartheid in a different way. An important element in this is the fact that most members of this class are likely to have spent ten or more years within the formal western-style educational system. Within that system, they have been socialized to accept capitalist and western values. Among the Africans, members of the educated middle classes are also almost certain to belong to orthodox Christian churches. And the socializing role of the church has been similar. Both school and church, in many ways, encourage an ethic of possessive individualism. Both institutions are deeply rooted within European culture and inevitably also project a picture of the superiority of that culture. But the black middle classes are not accepted in any way within the ruling white group. They are almost as subject as other blacks to daily humiliations, although to a limited extent the few very wealthy individuals can privatize themselves with a curtain of money. Thus the middle class shares common interest with the workers and peasants in the ending of the system. Because the middle class is relatively new, there are still many family ties crosscutting class membership. The distance between the situations of some of the individuals who might be characterized middle-class and the situation of some of the better-paid workers is small. Nevertheless, as Leo Kuper has pointed out, under conditions of oppression and discrimination, very small differences of actual situation can become very important in status terms (*An African Bourgeoisie: Race, Class, & Politics in South African* [New Haven: Yale University Press, 1965]; see, e.g., (116 f. and 398 f.). In particular within the African community, levels of western-style education are important indicators of status and can serve to differentiate the community into mutually suspicious groups. Upwardly mobile middle-class individuals are also likely to wish to establish their status in various ways by exaggerating the difference between themselves and the mass. This would make easy inter-class

The Eye of the Needle

communication and cooperation more difficult.

This middle class is still numerically small. It is probably less than 5 percent of the African group, though a larger proportion of the Coloured group and an even larger proportion of the small Indian community. Nevertheless, it is obviously politically important, since it has much readier access to the communication and organizational skills necessary for political action. Also this class is growing, and certain aspects of separate development encourage its growth.

Geographical divisions. The Coloured and Indian Populations are fairly concentrated regionally. But the Africans may be divided into three different geographical groups: those in the white-controlled urban areas, those living in the white-controlled rural areas, and those in the rural African homelands. It is important to bear this in mind, since not only do these three groups have in some ways different problems, but also the extent of their organizational separation is likely to be a significant factor affecting political action. In recent years, the government claims to have managed to jam an increasing proportion of Africans into the homelands. But if we consider only the potentially politically active population, then there has probably been little change in distribution, as the homelands have a high proportion of children, the old, and the sick. Thus it is probably sufficiently accurate for our purposes to say that about one-third of the Africans live in the industrial urban areas, about one-third in the white-controlled farming areas, about one-third in the homelands. In sociological terms, we could say that about one-third are urban proletariat, one-third are rural proletariat, and about one-third a subsistence peasantry. However, as I shall point out shortly, these are only approximate notions.

The one-third living in the white-controlled rural areas are highly atomized. They are to a large extent outside the traditional tribal organization structure, de facto if not de jure. Living scattered over large areas, they do not have the potential for developing new forms of organization enjoyed by the urban proletariat. Although they outnumber the white rural inhabitants by an enormous proportion, they are nevertheless virtually outside the political process. The total white control of all means of communication and transport in the countryside ensures this. The problem of the subsistence peasantry and the urban proletariat both derive from the despoliation of land by the whites. The Reserves are overcrowded, so there is not much land for the peasants. This leads to over cultivation and the vicious circle of declining land fertility. Although the historical origin of the problems is the same, it is experienced in different ways. The peasant wants more land; the worker wants more money and better working conditions. Of course, this simple picture ignores the fact that many subsistence peasants are also members of the urban proletariat both derive from the despoliation of land by the whites. These Reserves are overcrowded, so there is much land for the peasants. This leads to overcultivation and vicious circle of declining land fertility. Although the historical origin of the problems is the same, it is experienced in different ways. The peasant wants more land; the worker wants more money and better working conditions. Of course, this simple picture ignores the fact that many subsistence peasants are also members of the urban proletariat, that is, they are migrant laborers who sometimes from preference, but nearly always through legal constraint, have a small patch of land in the country but spend much of their working lives as factory workers. This also applies to a certain extent to the rural proletariat: Although families are often tied serf-like to the farms on which they work, nevertheless individual members are allowed to become migrant workers. Thus there is continual interchange between these three sectors, and this, to some extent, mitigates both the problem of communication and the possible difference of interests.

Religious differences. Within the Indian community, the division between Hindus (80 percent) and Moslems (20 percent) is culturally and socially very important. Within the Coloured community, there is a similar division between Christians and Moslems (Malay), although it is less important because the Malays constitute a smaller proportion of the Coloured community. Within the African community, the religious differences are more complex. First, there is the difference between pagan and Christian, which is linked

The Eye of the Needle

with the general difference between traditional rural orientation and western urban orientation. Second, there is the difference within the Christian group between the syncretistic Zionist groups, the more theologically orthodox Ethiopian groups, and the adherents of the various orthodox multiracial denominations. ² It is difficult to assess the political significance of these divisions. Perhaps the most significant distinction would be between denominations that tend to be a political and those that either encourage or do not discourage some political involvement. ³

DISPLACEMENT PHENOMENA

The third important mechanism for insuring stability in an unjust society is the development of a variety of what I have referred to as displacement phenomena. These displacement phenomena permit alternative forms of satisfaction, encapsulation, or the displacement of aggression onto some person or thing other than social system. There are many such displacement phenomena in South Africa.

The traditional opiate, religion, is one of the most obvious forms of such displacement: Christianity among Africans has frequently been notably pietistic and overworldly, promising later salvation in return for present suffering. It has been like this both such a religion provides a protection for Africans from the problems of having to make choices about action in this world. Religious groups of all kinds can offer an encapsulating supportive community to suffering individuals. In so doing, they help to alleviate some of the suffering. But they also serve to make it easier for people to adjust to and to accept the unjust social system. They treat the symptoms and not the disease. Similarly, the various tribal social and religious associations that spring up in the urban areas help to provide the uprooted migrant workers with a new community; but often they also encapsulate them within a cocoon that leaves the real world unchanged.

Another important displacement phenomenon associated with the churches has to do with leadership roles. It has often been pointed out that the African revolt against colonialism in South Africa and elsewhere in Africa manifested itself first within the churches. Breakaways from the white-dominated mission churches expressed both the rejection of white paternalism and, in the syncretistic Zionist churches, a rejection of the idea of the necessary superiority of all aspects of western convention and culture. These breakaway churches became the only modern institutions in which Africans could take the lead. But the essentially inadequate nature of this surrogate for social leadership is shown in a continued history of schism in these churches until today there are over two thousand different denominations. A major factor in many of the splits has been personality clashes between would-be leaders. Thus the intense politics of these groups takes up a vast amount of energy and again serves to encapsulate many enterprising individual within allblack organizations that exist on the margin of the exploitative society and cannot affect its structure.

I referred earlier to prejudices among the various ethnic groups toward one another. This is obviously fertile ground for displaced aggression and scapegoat phenomena. Perhaps the best-known example if this was the Durban riots in 1949, in which Zulus attacked Indians in a clear example of displaced aggression: They were not in a position to change the social system, so they attacked a weaker group within that social system, a group with which they had certain conflicts that were magnified into the major grievances of the social order.

Finally much displacement of aggression occurs within each community in the form of a high level of crime, of violence within the family, of alcoholism, and such phenomena. Faction fights often have their origins inland shortage, which leads to intense competition for land between clans in a particular community; and since they cannot do anything about enlarging the amount of land available to the African group as a whole, the only result is bloody conflict between groups within the African community.

The Eye of the Needle

SOCIAL CHANGE AND POLITICS

It will perhaps appear that I have painted a picture of a hopelessly and helplessly divided society in which the oppressed masses are so divided among themselves that there is no possibility at all of united action on their part to end their oppression. But, in fact, most societies are divided in ways at least similar to blacks in South Africa. Such divisions and the other mechanisms of control I have described do not constitute unsurpassable obstacles to change; they simply constitute problems that have to be taken into account in working out tactics and strategies. One has to be able to formulate policies that will take account of the slightly divergent interests of the various oppressed groups and attempt to weld these interests into one united force. But ignoring the conflicts that do exist within the oppressed groups cannot do this.

The present structure of the society was created by a particular pattern of military, political, and economic development. This pattern of development resulted in the entrenchment of white domination in a variety of ways. However the South African society is not a static society, and we now have to consider the extent to which the various social changes associated with the ongoing process of industrialization and economic growth affect the potential power and the attitudes and interests of the various groups in conflict in the South African situation. In such an analysis, we have to continually relate, on the one hand, the social changes that come about as a result of industrialization and, on the other hand, the ways in which particularly the white group reacts politically to the problems constituted by these social changes. Finally we must note the way in which their reaction affects the ongoing pattern of social change.

Before undertaking this analysis, I wish to stress that it is important to realize the impact of these changes on whites as well as on blacks. There has often been a tendency among analysts to assume that the whites are a static monolith and that any analysis of likely future events in South Africa must, as it were, ignore the whites, for it is assumed that they will remain such a static monolith. It is said that change will come from the blacks and therefore any processes of change that happen to be occurring within the white group are essentially irrelevant. It seems to me that this is a very serious mistake to make; I certainly agree that the major factor in bringing about political change in South Africa will be black action. But the way in which the white group reacts to black pressure will be enormously important. And this means that we must analyze developments within the white groups to see what likely modes of reaction there are. It means also that political activity directed at and within the white group in an attempt to create at least a group within white society who would be more willing to envisage change is very important. Even though it is unlikely that such a group will become the agent of change, it is important that, as pressures build up, there should be an increasing group of liberal or rational or pragmatic whites who will be able to encourage concessions in the face of overwhelming pressure rather than push in the direction of a final Moody showdown that will benefit neither group in South African society.

Nevertheless, as I have said, the black group will obviously be the important agent for bringing about political change in South Africa. So I shall begin this analysis by looking at the interrelationship between black political attitudes and organizational potential, the ongoing Process of industrialization and urbanization, and the Particular set of institutions that have been introduced by the present white government to act as some sort of Political safety valve for black aspirations.

IMPACT OF ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Let us begin by looking at the development of the economy. The most notable characteristics over the past twenty years have been first, the very rapid rate of industrial growth and, secondly, the large and growing imbalance between the growth levels in the white-animating industrial areas and the pattern of development in the black rural areas. The figures below give some idea of the rate of economic growth within the industrial sector. These figures show two very significant developments: First, they show the overall rate of

The Eye of the Needle

growth of the industrial sector; second, they show that African employment has been increasing rapidly—the percentage of Africans employed within these two sectors has been increasing, and at the same time the percentage of whites employed within the sector has been decreasing. Thus, one of the major effects of industrial growth has been a change in the relative pattern of employment favoring increasing African dominance of the industrial sector. This has meant that in addition to getting more jobs, Africans have progressively been getting more and more semiskilled and skilled jobs, Even now it is probable that the bulk of Africans workers in industry are in jobs that require virtually no training.

EMPLOYMENT IN MANUFACTURING AND CONSTRUCTION

	Total Employed	Africans Employed	%Of Total	Whites Employed	% Of Total
1951	742,000	360,000	48,5	250,000	33,7
1961	967,000	484,000	51.0	321,000	33,5
1972	1,650,000	950,000	57,6	340,000	20.6

Nevertheless the pattern of employment is changing in the direction of more and more Africans doing both skilled and unskilled jobs; at the same time, Indian and Coloured workers are also moving rapidly into semi skilled and skilled employment. However this continue to meet with resistance from white workers who have traditionally monopolized the highest paid skilled jobs The fact that the government supports the white workers means that a skill bottleneck has developed, which does threaten to slow down the overall development of the economy and hence also, of course, to slow down such growing significance of African employment within the economy as a whole. Nevertheless a slow down such as this is not likely to be accepted for very long by the consumption-oriented white electorate. So it is probable that methods will be found for overcoming the skilled employment bottleneck without overly threatening the privileged position of white workers.

The second noteworthy aspect of the economy is the imbalance between industrial development and their development of the so-called tribal homelands, the Africans rural areas, which remain essentially areas of subsistence peasant farming. The relationship between these subsistence areas and the industrial economy is a classic example of the progressive development of underdevelopment. The industrial economy drains the labor supply from the Reserves, thus ensuring that the wealth created by the laboring inhabitants of the rural areas is created in the white areas under white control. To some extent the rural agricultural areas have become market-oriented, dependent upon producing at least small cash crops and a certain amount of purchasing for consumption; but the wholesale and retail trade is virtually dominated by white interests, and hence any capital that is generated through agricultural development in these areas is rapidly siphoned off into the white areas. The limited encouragement of African entrepreneurs by the Bantu Investment Corporation does little to upset this overall pattern. Furthermore, even if it were possible to generate capital within these areas, any industries set up would have to compete with the established industries in the white areas, which benefit from economies of scale, from economies of urban concentration, and from being placed much closer to the markets and to the transport networks. So it is likely that without drastic reorganization of the economy the Pattern of this continuous development of underdevelopment of the Reserves will continue.

The government policy of developing so-called "border industries," that is, white-controlled industries in the white areas on the borders of the Reserves, which can draw on African labor from the homelands areas, is

The Eye of the Needle

not likely to play a major part in altering this pattern. First, it is not likely to do this because it is not likely to become an important element within the economy, since it is too expensive. Second, even if border areas were to become important economically, they would contribute nothing at all to the development of the African areas; they would merely smooth of labor exploration by ensuring that all the productive capacity of black workers was expanded within the white areas all their welfare needs would have to met in the area where they live, that is, in the black areas, and would thereby provide an additional drain on the limited finances of these black areas.

Both these economic changes clearly also involve large-scale changes in the social pattern. In particular, the process of industrialization involves changes for African workers of at least four different kinds: First, it involves changes in the pattern of relationships into which the individuals enter; second, it involves change in attitudes, perceptions, and needs; third, it involves changes in the kinds of problems with which the individual is faced; and fourth, it involves changes in the kind of organizational possibilities offered to individuals wishing to solve these problems.

We can understand these changes more fully by contrasting the new situation with the traditional pattern of life within the tribal societies. The following long quotation from Absalom Vilakazi's book *Zulu Transformations* (Pietermaritzburg: University of Natal Press, 1962, p. 111) describes the relationships between economy and society within Zulu life:

The Zulu practised kraal economy. This is basic to the whole economic life of the people. All property, whether in land or in cattle, is within the *umuzi*, which may be regarded as one body of individuals who share in the use and enjoyment of the products of the property so corporately held. The powers controls of property are vested in the kraal head that acts as trustee for the whole group. It is always insisted upon that property does not really belong to him for it is not the results of personal labours, and, in any case, concepts of personal property are not developed to the extent that they are in western society. Property held by the kraal head on behalf of the group may be, and often is, inherited from the forebears. The owners are the living and the dead people of the lineage, so that the use of this property has a ritual co-efficient. Over and above all these considerations, it is important to remember that the economy of any Zulu traditional kraal has a definitely sociological character; so that the land, the cattle and all other products of human activity must always be understood from three standpoints: economic, religious and social with the religious and social elements accented more than the economic. This explains why, for the Zulu, strict bookkeeping and calculation of costs or budgeting are not accepted with any enthusiasm. This seemingly stupid way of carrying on economic activity can be explained by the fact that people do not apply economic criteria or standards of reasoning when cause they are engaged in their economic activities. This is not because they are careless of economic consequences, but because calculation may interfere very seriously with social and religious considerations.

In this society, then, all relationships are multi-stranded, rather than single-stranded. The land is the cement that binds the tribal society together in one social, economic, and religious group.

The position of workers in the urban industrial society is obviously very different in many ways. First, they work for other people in return for a wage. Their relationship with employers is single-stranded, involving only the cash nexus; it is not set within a complex of mutual responsibilities, such as exists in the work situation in the tribal area. Second the home and the work place separated: in South Africa, they are ever more separated than unusual, since Africa residential areas are separated from the rest of the city and workers usually have to travel considerable distance to and from work. Third the role of the family changes. It is no longer an economic unit, working collectively: rather the individuals who work each have their own salaries, children becoming independent of their parents financially: often the mother has to work and this means that the young children are left at home for most of the day. So the whole coherence of the family is

The Eye of the Needle

broken down, and the ethical and religious principles of family relationship that existed in the tribal area are no longer relevant to the new problems facing the family.

In this new situation, the individual's traditional culture can no longer provide a guide; even traditional tribal dress is not practical for industrial work. Faced with this, how do most African workers coming into the industrial areas react? Max Gluckman has described the typical reaction as being a process of alternation: that is, the migrant worker adopts new behavior patterns in the cities, but retains traditional behavior patterns for life back in the rural areas (*Order and Rebellion in Tribal Africa* [New York: Free Press of Glencoe, 1963], pp. 223f.). So there is a process in which all individuals move from one culture into the other and back again, rather than an ongoing process of acculturation. But this means that while the workers are in the city, they behave as city workers, not as rural peasants. It also means that as the period is extended in which the African workers are becoming more dependent upon the city and the rural homelands are becoming less viable, the process of acculturation is likewise extended.

This process of acculturation is necessarily impeded and distorted by the fact that every attempt is made to keep urban African workers on the margin of the urbanized society. Until new institutions have grown up to replace the solidarity of tribal society with some new form of integration into a balanced society, the African workers in South Africa will continue to resemble what has been described by sociologists as a mass society. A mass society is a society in which individuals are atomized in the sense that they have no strong links with other members of the society. Such individuals tend to be individually insecure and socially unstable, as they seek for some sense of personal identity. Social instability often manifests itself in acts of apparently motiveless mass violence; thus such a mass society is likely to be relatively insecure, but at the same time, lacking organization and a coherent sense of direction, it is unlikely to produce the sort of forces that could channel the latent violence in a revolutionary direction.

In South Africa the atomization of mass society is exacerbated by three factors: First, poverty and unemployment mean a continuous competition for jobs between workers; second, the inadequate social infrastructure means competition for housing and other facilities; third, the fact that African workers are subject to the pass laws and hence have no security of tenure in the urban areas means that they are in a continuous state of fear and suspicion. The net result of this is a feeling of resigned hostility toward the unpleasant but necessary urban environment.

Nevertheless, placed in that urban environment, it is inevitable that there will be a change in the pattern of needs and expectations of individual workers. Traditional society, subsistence-oriented, was accustomed to a constant and low standard of living. But within the urban environment, in a cash economy, and subject, as whites are, to the continuous pressures of advertising, the Africans undergo a change in their consumption patterns. This is a fact of the utmost significance, since it means that the level of relative deprivation of African workers in the urban areas is high, and is likely to remain high even if there is a small increase in their wages. That is, urban African workers do not compare their standards of living with the standard which they might have had, had they remained in the rural areas. They compare it instead with the standard of living of other groups within the urban areas.

Apologists for the present situation in South Africa explain the poverty of Africans by adducing their traditional culture, their lack of skills, and often their alleged racial inferiority. If African workers were to accept this type of explanation, then their level of dissatisfaction would not have any political significance, since it would not be directed against the political regime. However, there is no indication that they do accept such explanations. In fact, the evidence is all in the opposite direction, that they perceive their problems as having roots in the political and social organization of the society, rather than in any individual deficiency of their own. For example, according to Lawrence Schlemmer, over 80 percent of a random sample of 350 African township residents endorsed, supported, and added to the statement: Africans are poor

The Eye of the Needle

because they are treated badly and not given opportunities (*in Labour Organisation and the African Worker*, ed. D.B. Horner [Johannesburg: South African Institute of Race Relations, 1975], pp. 3-20). These Durban respondents indicate they are aware that their problems are socially and politically determined rather than a result of some adverse fate. Such awareness is the first prerequisite for action to change the situation.

However, while this awareness itself remains atomized, while it remains simply the serial opinions of a large number of individuals, it has no further political significance. Thus our question must be: To what extent is it likely to lead to more organized political action?

ORGANIZATIONAL POSSIBILITIES

I have already mentioned the role played by various religious and tribal groupings within the urban areas in helping to reintegrate the atomized urban workers. However, as I pointed out, the overall effect of this kind of organization is more to encapsulate individuals within a marginal social group than to orient them toward some form of social and political activity. Thus these groups by themselves are not likely to have any political significance unless they can be integrated into a wider political movement by some independent source of political activity within the black community. (Otherwise they are likely to be manipulated in a non-political direction by the dominant group.) During the 1950s there was such an independent source of political activity in the two major political organizations: the [African National Congress](#) and the [Pan African Congress](#). However, both these organizations were banned in 1960 and since then there has been no effective open political organization among urban African groups in South Africa. The white government, partly because of its own enormous power, easily disposed of the ANC and the PAC but also partly because of their internal weaknesses. Although both were at times able to mobilize large numbers of Africans for specific issues, neither ever managed to build up the kind of structured political organization that could have maintained support between individual campaigns and could have linked many different locally based campaigns into one overall strategy. But even had these organizations been drastically improved, it is probable that this would not have changed the situation much; for there was no source of power available to Africans in the fifties. They had no access to any of the possible weapons that an oppressed class could use. In particular, their position in the economy was still sufficiently marginal for them to lack economic bargaining power.

Since then the machinery of political repression has made it impossible for any new major African political organization to be established within the urban areas. The institutions of separate development that have been set up to provide some sort of political institution for Africans are largely irrelevant to urban concerns. They are based on the rural homelands areas and their powers are limited to the solving of the problems that might arise within these areas. Any new organizational form that arises to fill this vacuum must be based first, on a set of problems common to large numbers of Africans in their everyday experience and, second, on some pre-existing institution that serves to bring them together in some way. Third, if such an organization is to generate any sort of power, it must arise within a sector of the society in which some potential for the generation of such power exists. For example, most African workers have housing problems. They are crammed tightly together in residential areas and therefore the first two conditions are given. Nevertheless there is no way in which such an association of African tenants could use their position as tenants to generate power. As tenants the only activity or action they could undertake would be to refuse to pay their rent, and this would be sufficiently marginal an act to have no significant impact on the political scene in South Africa. To be more precise, although it would have considerable publicity impact, it would not arouse the kind of power threat to the dominant group that could not be very easily contained.

Reflecting upon the above analysis, it is obvious that there is only one sphere in which Africans do have potential power and in which their power potential is in fact growing: This is within the economy. As industrial workers, Africans have common sets of problems in a common factory environment that forces them

The Eye of the Needle

together in large groups. Although they do not have ordinary trade-union rights and may not strike, nevertheless African workers are legally allowed to form trade unions ⁴. Even in the absence of trade unions, it is probable that the increasingly pivotal nature of their role in economy will push them toward various forms of industrial actions. This has been dramatically demonstrated at least twice in South Africa recently. At the end of 1971, almost the entire African work force in Namibia (South-West Africa) went on strike for improved conditions and changes in the contract system. The government was obliged to make at least some concessions; the extent of the strikes was such that it was not possible to take the traditional large-scale punitive action. Second in January 1972, in Durban, South Africa witnessed perhaps the largest series of strikes that has ever occurred here. Nearly one hundred thousand mainly African workers went on strike in a large number of different factories. Although these strikes are illegal, the government has been forced to accept them, and in many cases the workers have won increases in wages.

What is perhaps more important, they have also gained an awareness of their potential power and of the virtues of solidarity; and it is likely that from this there will be considerable development of African trade unionism. As we have seen, African trade unions, though legal, cannot strike, and in fact are severely limited in the actions, they can take by law. However, in very few societies have trade unions arisen as a result of government legalization; even white trade unionism in South Africa became recognized and legally backed only as a result of long and sometimes exceedingly bloody struggles.

Trade unionism and worker organizations arise when the economy has developed to the point where the workers do have potential bargaining power. This bargaining power arises, first, out of a declining competition as a result of an increase in the total number of employed; second, it arises as the skill level rises and it therefore becomes more difficult and more financially inconvenient for employers to replace striking workers. This situation has now been reached in South Africa. What this means is that it is probable that in the case of relatively small strikes or actions organized in individual factories, employers are likely to see it in their interest to reach some sort of accommodation with the workers rather than to call in the police and have their condition force arrested, which would result in large interruptions in production and the necessity of training new workers to fill the place of the old. Third, as the Durban and the Ovambo ⁵ strikes indicate, if labor action takes place on large scale, it is very difficult for the Government to deal with it, particularly significant in Durban was the fact that there was no apparent central organisation, rather the strikes spread spontaneously from plant to plant. Under these conditions, government action is possible against leadership, since there is no leadership, and government action against a hundred thousand workers who make up the bulk of the workforce in the second industrial city of the country is equally impossible. It is impossible both for economic reasons and for reasons of general publicity.

Informal worker organizations and formal trade unions that arise in the situation are not likely to be directly political. That is, they are not likely to make specifically political demands in connection with political rights. Nevertheless their existence and their power is a political fact of great importance. The issue of politics is the distribution of resources within the community and a strong trade union movement could play an important role in enabling the African group to force some sort of redistribution of resources within the community without necessarily having this conflict mediated through ordinary political institutions. Also, this awareness among blacks of their potential power and among whites of blacks' potential power will of itself have significant consequences at a purely political level.

SEPARATE DEVELOPMENT VS. BLACK CONSCIOUSNESS

Although no new mass African political organization has emerged in recent years, nevertheless there have been two significant political developments: First, some of the more important homeland leaders, and particularly Chief Buthelezi and Chief Matanzima, have begun to extend their interest beyond purely homeland affairs and to articulate clearly and loudly the demands of urban Africans as well as of the

The Eye of the Needle

inhabitants of the homelands. [6](#) Within the Coloured community, the Labour Party has similarly taken advantage of the institutions of separate development to develop support for the outright condemnation of separate development. Parallel to this, there has grown up a movement that condemns all collaboration with the institutions of separate development and preaches black solidarity through the philosophy of [Black Consciousness](#).

The idea behind separate development is that South Africa is made up of a number of distinct ethnic communities having few interests in common and that each community should therefore be able to run its own affairs. However, in fact, South Africa is one common society and the implementation of the theory of separate development is such that it leaves almost the entire common economy purely in the hands and under the control of the white government. This means that in fact the institutions of separate development have no real power to affect the key issues within South African society and particularly to affect the question of the distribution of wealth within the society. Separate development is a legitimating ideology rather than a factual state of affairs. But in-so-far as it is a legitimating ideology used by the [National Party](#) to justify continued white rule, those leaders who emerge within the institutions of separate development are in a sense protected by the role they play in National Party thinking. The National Party has created these institutions to give voice to what it considered to be authentic representatives of the various ethnic communities, and so the National Party can scarcely now adopt precisely the same kind and of oppressive tactics against these leaders as it has adopted in the past against black leaders. This is of course a question of degree and individuals involved in separate development politics have been banned in the past, and Special Branch harassment has occurred.

Nevertheless it is very difficult for the Government to touch the most important leaders and these leaders have been condemning separate development and continued white domination in no uncertain terms. But the problem is that the institutions of separate development constitute a platform from which to speak but not a power base from which to act. There presumably comes a time when these leaders will have to accept that the white government is not going to accede to any of their more basic demands. The question is: What will they do at that point? The alternatives will be either to attempt, within the framework, to undertake alleviating measures that will improve the situation of some blacks, or else to attempt to develop a strategy that either goes outside the framework of separate development or uses its institutions in an attempt to develop some organizational power. The second option is obviously the more dangerous from the immediate point of view, since it cannot be predicted with certainty what the white government will do if these leaders do become a genuine threat of this sort. On the other hand, by remaining quietly within the limitations of the framework, they cannot hope to achieve any of their aims.

As I have already pointed out, the nature of the interlocking economies of the white-controlled area and the African homelands is such that the homeland economy cannot hope to become viable. They may be able to attract a limited amount of investment, but such investment is not likely to change the essential structure of the relationships. Even within the sphere of agriculture, it is probable that the homeland leaders can do little.

In the present system of land tenure, the homeland agricultural areas are over-farmed. There are two possible solutions to this: The first one is to encourage individual tenure to boost the more successful individual farmers, and hence to develop a master-farmer class who probably will utilize the land more successfully. But the cost of this would be depriving other individuals of the land they do have, beginning a process of concentration of land ownership and developing within the homeland areas a split between a land-owning class and a landless rural proletariat. This might increase the overall level of production, but would produce other serious social dislocations that might prove economically more costly in the long run.

The alternative might be to attempt to develop a socialist model of cooperative farming- by pooling the land and the available resources, using the large units as a basis for borrowing, generating, and reinvesting

The Eye of the Needle

capital, and also for the more rational planning and utilization of the resources that do exist. However, it is quite possible that the South African Government would not in the first place permit such a socialist solution. Second, it is highly unlikely that a socialist enclave within a predominantly capitalist economy and capitalist society would be viable anyway. The patterns of behavior that would need to develop would be continually contradicted and inhibited by the overall patterns of behavior and motivations in the larger society.

Although such experiments should be tried, it is also unlikely that they would change in any significant way the structure of relationship between homeland satellite and white-controlled metropolis. Thus the homeland waders cannot hope to use the development of the Reserves as a method of solving the problems of other than a very small minority of the African population. Yet, they are at present powerless within the urban areas and so unless they can devise a strategy that extends their power to the urban areas they are not likely to be able to do anything there either. Associated with this is the problem, of course, that the institutions of separate development divide the majority black population into more than ten separate groups, each of which independently is a minority in the society. None of these groups individually can hope to outweigh continued white dominance.

Faced with these problems the proponents of black consciousness, and in particular the [South African Student Organisation](#) (SASO) and the [Black People's Convention](#) (BPC), have condemned outright any collaboration whatsoever with the institutions of separate development. Instead, they advocate a policy of black solidarity, based ideologically on the rejection of imposed western culture, the reassertion of black values, and the development of a new culture, and based organizationally on the idea of developing community organizations around specific problems of specific communities in various parts of South Africa. The idea of black consciousness has certainly made considerable impact in South Africa in the last few years. However, both the ideological work of articulating and propagating a new black culture and the organizational work of developing community organizations seem for the moment not to have progressed very far.

There are a number of reasons for this, but it seems to me that one of the most important is the predominantly middle-class origin of the concept of black consciousness. First, it is borrowed from the idea of black consciousness as developed in the United States, where racial discrimination and cultural oppression are the salient issues. Although the black population is relatively poorer than the white population, the major demand has been that their position should be improved simply by ending discrimination and by integrating the black community into the existing economic structure on a more equal footing. Black consciousness dealt more with the cultural rights than with the economic rights of the black community, the assumption behind this being that once the cultural rights were respected; the economic rights would come of themselves.

However, in South Africa, the situation is very different. I have already pointed out the extent to which the African middle class and black middle class in general have been much more highly subjected to the socialization process of western education, and therefore are likely to have a much more ambivalent attitude toward western, or so called white culture, than are working- class individuals who have had very little experience of such a culture. On the one hand the middle class are likely to be attracted toward the model of westernization and, on the other hand, they are likely to be much more affected by a refusal on the part of the whites to accept them as western. This ambivalent attitude and its result in psychological insecurity is likely to make the issues of culture and of racial discrimination much more salient for these individuals than it is for members of the working class. But the very fact that the stress is laid upon white oppression of black makes it difficult for these individuals to perceive this difference. They automatically project their perception of the problem onto all other blacks and assume a similarity of perspective and an ease of communication between different blacks that probably is not there. Because they fail to realize that people in different class

The Eye of the Needle

situations suffer the effects of oppression in different ways, they have not been able to develop an ideology that adequately links those different perspectives in a model that both interprets present reality and projects a coherent alternative reality. Their present organizational weakness probably has a similar root.

One has, however, to distinguish between (1) the concept of black consciousness, (2) the specific ideological intent given this concept by SASO and the BPC, and (3) the organizational structure of those two groups. The psychological oppression resulting from almost a century of control by a foreign culture is enormously important, and the concept of black consciousness has been widely accepted by blacks as a means of escape from this psychological oppression. Nevertheless, it is probable that for most it is understood very simply as being a way of asserting their own individual dignity and does not have the detailed ideological implication that it does for SASO and the BPC. Furthermore, the acceptance of the slogan of black consciousness and the spread of the slogan by no means indicates an acceptance of the leadership of BPC and SASO as organizations. The slogan has in fact been taken over by several of the leaders of separate development institutions, who use it to assert the dignity of blacks and the necessity of solidarity between the various black groups. In a sense, black consciousness has certainly furthered the development of black solidarity in South Africa. But it is people like Chief Buthelezi who are recognized by the bulk of Africans as their present leaders, while the BPC is probably known by a relatively small percentage of predominantly middle-class blacks.

Nevertheless this does not necessarily mean that the Buthelezi strategy is better than the BPC's. We need to analyze more closely the arguments for and against attempting to use the instruments of separate development to bring about the end of separate development. The three main arguments against are (1) that working within the institutions of separate development boost, 'National Party policy and makes the regime respectable in the eyes of the world; (2) that although these institutions do provide a platform, nevertheless the limit within which one can legitimately move are very rigidly defined so that one has to attack alternative strategies, which might in fact be more successful, in order to retain the support of the government; (3) that by their very nature these institutions divide the black community, promote conflict between the different groups, and facilitate the manipulation by the government of any ethnic prejudices that do exist.

These are strong arguments; but it seems to me that there are equally strong arguments in favor of attempting to utilize these institutions in various ways:

1. It is possible, as Chief Buthelezi has done, to make clear that the fact that one uses the institutions in no way indicates support for the policy of separate development or acceptance of continued white control over the major areas of South Africa.

2. It is important to remember that if anti-apartheid forces do reject these institutions, the institutions will nevertheless continue to exist. The government will always be able to find puppet-like blacks who will be able to project to the outside world the image of some black support for separate development and who will speak positively in favor of separate development. Although such puppets are never likely to get mass black support, it is important to realize that they could develop into a de-mobilizing elite, whose very existence discourages further development of black political organizations? In particular, anybody who controls a local government body expending large sums of money can build up support through a process of patronage, near corruption, and actual corruption. It would be possible for unscrupulous individuals to build up a political machine that provided a variety of benefits to a range of clients who would constitute, in any event, an economic elite within the community, would therefore be in a position to monopolize educational resources in the community, and in general could inhibit the development of genuine political organizations within that community.

3. It must be remembered that political organization outside the institutions of separate development is still

The Eye of the Needle

very risky. It is in fact unlikely that the government would long permit SASO and the BPC to continue to function. The Natal Indian Congress, which also attempts to operate outside the institutions of separate development, has been badly hit by the banning of its leader, and such bannings are likely to be used against any organization that follows a similar strategy. ⁷ On the other hand, working within the institutions of separate development does give one some protection. Further more, the elections organized in connection with these institutions can be very valuable organizing tools; that is, organizing around an election is one of the best means for actually building up political support and for propagating a particular policy. In the last resort, the only way to show that these institutions are phony is by taking them over and showing it from within, rather than by permitting a group of puppets to run these institutions for their own benefit and the benefit of a small elite within each community.

It is clear, however, that simply controlling these institutions is not enough. Some further strategy has to be developed for actual mass mobilization of some so here that the improving power potential of the working class becomes significant. If the homeland leaders can link up with the working class, then there is a possibility of a movement that has both potential power and a developing political voice. Such a facilitated by the fact that African workers are, in theory at least, citizens in the homelands, and therefore have a vote in the homelands. This means that homeland leaders are likely to be under pressure large sector of their electorates to take some more positive form of action against apartheid, and in particular to do something about the position of urban African workers. If such a link-up can be made, then it will make it even more difficult for the government to take against developing African trade unions in the areas.

To summarize, the development of the economy is producing a black proletariat with increasing bargaining power, suffering from severe relative deprivation and increasingly willing to use its bargaining power. Political leaders using the instruments of separate development may be able to link up with this growing urban movement and thereby develop a coherent powerful black political movement in South Africa. The problems of the urban working class transcend ethnic differences within the African group and although to a lesser extent, the differences between the African groups on the one hand and the Indian and Coloured groups on the other. Insofar as Coloured and Indian workers at present have normal trade and also, on the whole, have better jobs than Africans may be that in the future they will attempt to protect relatively privileged position by using their trade union rights. However, it is unlikely that this will succeed, both because the majority of Coloured and Indian workers are still in fact in low-status, low-skilled jobs and also because they lack the political rights that are an essential ingredient in the ability of the white workers to achieve such an entrenched political and economic position. Thus there are tendencies toward a unified black approach. But it is important to remember that these are only tendencies, and that there remain divisions that could be skillfully manipulated by white groups in order to maintain white control. However, their ability to manipulate these divisions depends to a considerable extent on developments among- whites. We must now therefore analyze changes in white attitudes and white politics.

WHITE REACTIONS

How will whites react to increasing black pressure? To what extent will they be willing to make compromises?

To what extent will they be able to develop intelligent strategies of self-defense? Or to what extent are they more likely to react with outright resistance, and thereby to heighten the conflict within the society?

To answer these questions, it is necessary to have some understanding of white motivations and to understand also the way in which white culture is being changed by the ongoing impact of industrialization, urbanization, high-levels of education, and different types of contacts with the outside world. The first point to be made is that, although South African society would seem to be a perfect machine whereby whites

The Eye of the Needle

exploit blacks, nevertheless the average white South African is not simply a rational exploiter. White South Africans do take their rights to exploit blacks for granted, but their psychic and cultural makeup is much more complex than that. They are very ignorant of how their society works; they are ignorant of history and of the nature of social relationships; they are very insecure, and underlying their apparent arrogance is often a deep fear both of blacks and of any pattern of behavior that threatens their perceptions of the naturalness of their own behavior patterns, and hence of the naturalness of their right to exploit. Thus we cannot assume that they will necessarily react rationally to any form of challenge. The most difficult problem in trying to untangle the different elements in white culture is the attempt to work out the precise relationship between race prejudice and economic self-interest. The institutions of racial discrimination clearly favor the economic interests of the whites; but this does not mean that we can necessarily deduce that racial discrimination and race prejudice are purely a function of whites' perceived economic self-interests. On the other hand, one cannot necessarily assume that the liberalizing impact of education and wider contacts with the outside world will necessarily lead to a decreased will to dominate and to exploit.

One of the more facile arguments that is advanced about South Africa's future is that the process of economic development will of itself lead to a liberalizing of white attitudes, to a declining prejudice, and to a move toward a more open and just society.

The assumption underlying this argument is that capitalism involves the rational utilization of resources in the pursuit of profit. Since labor is one of the major resources of an economy and since race prejudice, by denying the ability of black workers, leads to a non-optimum utilization of their labor, it is argued that their capitalist motivation will necessarily lead white entrepreneurs to a rational analysis of the real nature of the capacities of black workers; that is, they will discover that blacks are in fact not inferior and, in order to better utilize their labor, will stop treating them as inferior. A supplementary hypothesis is that insofar as this will mean increased education and training facilities for Africans and will mean that they will be doing skilled jobs, they will thereby be in a position to demonstrate to white workers that they are in fact their equal, and white workers will also come to accept their equality.

However, there are at least three weaknesses in this argument: First, capitalists are not necessarily any more rational than other people; they may seek profit, but they seek it within the context of their own presuppositions, and these are quite likely to blind them to the actual profit potentialities inherent in the situation. Second, even if entrepreneurs are rational, faced with resistance from the skilled white workers and hence with the loss of production that might ensue if they attempt to advance black workers, it is in fact probably more rational for them to accept the prejudices of the white workers and operate within that framework. Third, the present system, by making it possible to pay black workers at very low rates, is in fact in many ways economically quite rational from the point of view of the capitalist, if not from the viewpoint of the workers.

In an article in 1960, Leo Kuper advanced an opposite argument to the effect that the South African system was ideally designed to heighten racial tension and that therefore one should expect a continuing increase in race prejudice rather than any decrease ("The Heightening of Racial Tensions," *Race*, vol. 2 [1960], pp. 24-32). Although there is undoubtedly much truth in the idea that government policies do foster racial prejudice among the whites, it nevertheless cannot be said that since 1960 race prejudice has increased. In fact, for a variety of reasons, it would seem to have decreased:

There is certainly much less blind ignorant hatred of blacks by whites; there is certainly a decrease in the more ridiculous forms of prejudice; and there is certainly an increased recognition of the capacities of black peoples. This can be shown on a number of levels, including the willingness of white government ministers to meet black counterparts from other states and to mix socially with them. In part this is a function of the general development of education in South Africa. Also it is important to remember that the white

The Eye of the Needle

community here is in no sense culturally autonomous. The English-speaking community particularly depends for most of its culture, its literature, even its films and popular magazines on Britain and the United States. This means that as much as it might attempt to protect itself, it is nevertheless influenced by change that occurs elsewhere, and the fact that over the last ten to fifteen years there has been considerable change in attitudes to race prejudice within English-language culture outside South Africa has had profound effects here also. These effects and the general world hostility to race discrimination have also, to some extent brought about change in the Afrikaner attitudes. There does seem to be a slow decline in prejudice, but we cannot, as I have already pointed out, deduce from this that there will be a decline in willingness to dominate.

Nevertheless the decline in prejudice is significant, because one of the important irrational factors underlying any refusal to compromise with black demands has been the image carried in many white minds of innate black savagery. There has been the fear that any compromise, any rights offered to blacks, would lead inevitably to some atavistic outburst on their part; that is, many whites have interpreted to themselves the necessity of controlling the blacks in terms of the innate savagery of blacks rather than in terms of a conflict of interests between the white desire to exploit and the black desire to cease being exploited. Such prejudice leads people to see any move toward change in all-or-nothing terms, and in that case the answer is inevitably nothing. Thus the decline of this kind of prejudice can at least produce a white population who, although not willing voluntarily to change the situation, will be sufficiently intelligent to realize when compromises will be in their interests. Any such compromises will of course be designed to maintain white control, but nevertheless a series of compromises of this sort can move the society away from one of absolute dominance in the direction of a more equal society.

A survey of the attitudes and opinions of white voters undertaken by Schlemmer and myself in Durban in 1971 led us to divide the respondents into three general categories in regard to their racial and political attitudes. The first categories were the "*Verkramp*," that is, individuals showing both material self-interest and a high level of racial prejudice. The second group we described as "pragmatic"; these showed that they were still mainly concerned with white economic interests, but they had a much lower level of race prejudice and hence were willing to do away with a number of aspects of discriminatory legislation that they saw as being possibly in the long run detrimental to white economic interests. The final group we described as "*Verlig*." The *Verlig* individuals were both relatively low in race prejudice and at the same time seemed much more willing than the other voters to take into consideration the economic interests of groups other than the white group in South African society. The terms "*Verkramp*" and "*Verlig*" have been widely used in South African politics in the last few years to categorize, on the one hand, "rigid and conservative" and, on the other, "enlightened" political beliefs.

The relative distribution of the three types varied considerably from the English to the Afrikaans sample. Nevertheless, there were significant numbers of *Verlig* voters in each sample. We estimated that 30 percent of the English respondents were *Verlig*, 50 percent pragmatic, and only 20 percent *Verkramp*. On the other hand, the Afrikaans respondents were 20 percent *Verlig*, 25 percent pragmatic, and 55 percent *Verkramp*.

Since Afrikaans voters represent about 60 percent of the electorate while the English represent only 40 percent, the *Verkramp* section is still the predominant group in the electorate. Nevertheless both the pragmatic and the *Verligtes* are of considerable size and hence are likely to be of considerable importance in determining future policy developments. Nearly all the Afrikaans-speaking *Verligtes* in our sample continue to support the National Party. This means that within the National Party, the most conservative and the most white-dominance-oriented of the three major white parties, there exists a minority which would be willing at least to accept fairly radical changes of policy and perhaps even to work for such radical changes of policy.

The Eye of the Needle

ALTERNATIVE WHITE STRATEGIES

Assuming that the white group decided to react to increasing black pressure by attempting to find compromises that would improve the situation of blacks and at the same time maintain white rule, what strategies are open to them? There are two.

The first is to speed up the development of the rural homeland areas and perhaps increase them in size geographically. This might have the effect of splitting the homeland politicians from the urban proletariat, whose interest would not be met by such a policy, and thereby dividing the black community and decreasing the numerical advantage that blacks have at present over whites. It would leave the essential institutions of economic exploitation still in the white areas and still untouched.

The second strategy would involve an attempt at outright co-option of black leadership into the white group. If such a strategy were tried, the class divisions within the black community would be an important factor. As we have seen there is a growing middle class, which is capitalist oriented and attracted in many ways to the western cultural model. The policy of the Progressive Party, which envisages extending the franchise to this group and at the same time removing much of the discriminatory legislation that prevents them from integrating with the white community, might have the effect, once more, of splitting the black community and, at the same time, depriving the working class of potential leadership among the disaffected black middle classes. Such a policy would also leave the essential institutions of economic exploitation intact and maintain the society as highly unequal, but with inequalities determined in purely class terms rather than in racial terms. However, this policy would perhaps require a degree of lucidity that at present most white voters do not have, since it would require a very low level of race prejudice in order to work. The Progressive Party is likely to slowly increase its support among English-speaking voters in the next few years, but it is very unlikely to become a dominant force. [8](#)

Another policy, which is something of a cross between these two, is also a possibility: This would be the attempt to integrate the two minority black communities, that is the Coloured community and the Indian community, into the white group, and at the same time speed up the development of the homelands to make some concessions, short of a sharing in political power, to the African urban middle class. This policy would play on at least three different potential divisions within the black community: the ethnic division between Coloured and Indian on the one hand and African on the other; the class-geographical division between the interests of the urban proletariat and the interests of the rural peasantry; and finally the purely class division of interests between the urban middle class and the urban proletariat.

Three points should be made about these strategies. First, none of them would radically alter the fact that South Africa is a highly unequal society. Second, nevertheless, any one of these strategies would make South Africa a much less harsh and a much more livable society than it is at present. They would move South Africa toward the model of other types of unequal societies but would decrease some of the more searing indignities of a racially stratified society. Third, although each of these strategies can be seen from the white perspective as an attempt to maintain power by playing on potential divisions within the black group, there is no guarantee that any of these strategies would actually succeed.

Heribert Adam has described present-day South Africa as "a pragmatic race oligarchy," and he comments on the capacities for adaptation of present-day leadership as follows:

They are not, as often viewed by the outside world, blindly fumbling toward their inevitable end. They are effective technocrats, who are establishing an increasingly unshakeable oligarchy in a society where the wealth of an advanced industrialization in the hands of the few whites coexists with the relative deprivation of the nonwhites. If this is to be cemented by a gradual deracialization and economic concessions, South

The Eye of the Needle

African's white elite is capable of achieving this in spite of internal contradictions (Modernizing Racial Domination [Berkeley: University of California Press, 1971], pp. 181-82).

I think that Adam here perhaps slightly exaggerates the present rationality of the white elite, but nevertheless the quotation adequately sums up both the kinds of change that can potentially come from the whites and the significance of those changes for the overall society.

LIBERALIZING INSTITUTIONS?

Within white society and particularly within the English-speaking community, there are three institutions that are avowedly much more liberal and that one might expect to play some role in moving the whites toward a far more liberal position than that described above. These institutions are the English-language press, the English universities, and the Christian church. These three institutions are all particularly sensitive to overseas pressure and overseas opinion, and all three claim to be playing an important liberalizing role within the South African society.

The English-language press. The press is certainly frequently critical of government policy and even of the policies of the opposition United Party. Nevertheless the press caters to the needs and interests of a predominantly white readership and the picture of the world it purveys is of a predominantly white world. The news columns frequently clash with the opinion columns, in that stories are written from a white perspective. The press is also, of course, unquestioningly capitalist. While the degree of labor exploitation might be debated, the principle of labor exploitation is not. Of course, the press operates within both legal and economic constraints, and it may well be that these constraints make the present policy of the press inevitable. But the fact remains that the press is essentially a white capitalist press.

The English-language universities. Leaders in the English-language universities have on the whole spoken out strongly against infringements of academic freedom and have backed the right of students to protest government action. But their protest has been purely verbal: They have never risked any direct confrontation with the government over the principles that they claim to hold sacred. Furthermore, the content of their teaching is such as to help prepare white technocrats for their positions within the white elite. There are perhaps a handful of departments in which it is accepted that an academic discipline has a critical role to play within society, and that what is taught has to be seen in its overall social perspectives; but this is rare. Architects, engineers, doctors, scientists are all going to exercise their skills within their particular social structure, within their particular configuration of interests. And the effect of the exercise of their skills cannot be separated from the interest structure of the society. This fact is virtually ignored by South African universities. Their pose of virtuous academic neutrality in fact means that they are efficient servants of the existing interest structure. And they do in fact have the freedom to behave differently if they wished to; there is the potential for a much more highly critical approach in all disciplines at these universities. The English-language universities argue that if they did adopt a more critical stance, the government would take away their subsidies. This may well be true, but it must be made clear what this argument means: Faced with the choice between academic honesty and the continuation of government subsidies that enable the staff to draw salaries more than ten times higher than African workers, the English-language universities unanimously choose the higher salaries.

The church. Of the three groups, the church is perhaps the most significant, for two reasons. First, it is much more closely integrated into an international community and therefore even more sensitive to pressures from this community. Second, it is the only one of the institutions in which there are very large numbers of blacks. It is therefore the only multiracial institution in South African society in which blacks could come to take up leadership positions in proportion to their number in the outside society. The church hierarchies, having a Christian training which their congregations lack, have on the whole been far more liberal in approach than

The Eye of the Needle

have the white congregations. Nonetheless, the majority of church leaders seem content to continue to operate within the framework of the status quo and see Christianity as what I have described as an internal morality rather than as a transcendent morality that challenges the status quo. They think it more important to ensure that their white congregations continue to come to church than to ensure that they begin to behave in a Christian fashion.

It has to be concluded that within all three of these institutions white liberals remain whites first and liberals second. They are offended by the barbarities of South African society but not sufficiently outraged to be willing to risk sacrificing their own privileged positions. This is not merely a question of cowardice; it also represents both a lack of imagination and ignorance. University lecturers or clergy may well be unaware of the extent to which their incomes or lifestyles are based on the exploitation of black labor. Furthermore, they may be quite unaware that it would be possible to live differently from the way in which an average white South African lives. But I must repeat that this does not mean that white liberals are unimportant or that the task of attempting to further liberalize white attitudes is in itself either unimportant or impossible. White liberals and liberal institutions of the type I have described can at least help to inject a greater element of rationality into white thinking.

INTERNATIONAL PRESSURE

Over the last twenty years, important changes in the international situation, in particular the ending of the European colonial dominance over Africa and Asia has led to increasing criticism of racism in South Africa. The criticism is beginning to turn into action, and various forms of pressure against continued white dominance are either being practiced or being envisaged. These forms of pressure have at least some impact either positive or negative on the internal situation in South Africa; so it is important to evaluate them.

Sport. Sport is the area of greatest visible impact so far. The widespread boycotts of South African sporting teams have achieved three things: (1) They have brought home in an unavoidable form the fact of changed racial attitudes in the rest of the world. (2) They have led many non-political whites to attack the government, thereby helping to change the climate of fear that has inhibited political action over the past decade. (3) Many athletes have now expressed their willingness to play mixed sport and presumably, if the pressure is kept up, will actually find ways of doing so, since mixed sport is, in certain circumstances, not illegal. Once they do begin to do this, it is likely that this form of contact will have some impact on their racial attitudes and on their voting behavior. Presumably it can only have a positive effect, although by itself, of course, this would be of relatively minor significance. There seem to be no negative effects whatsoever due to the sport boycott.

Culture. It is difficult to assess what effect a boycott in the cultural sphere has; certainly it is a minor irritant to some whites at least, and particularly when it concerns pop singers. It probably alienates some otherwise non-political people from the government. The suggested negative effect of such a cultural boycott is that it deprives white audiences of intellectual stimulation which might lead them to question themselves and the present situation in South Africa. There is probably something in this argument. The objection that playwrights filmmakers have to having their products shown South Africa must be that audiences are unracial. It is important to remember that this only applies to professional shows; there is at present no legislation preventing private film clubs from being multiracial, nor is there any legislation preventing private theater clubs from being multiracial. Therefore if critics of South Africa were to lay down the single criterion that all performances should be before multiracial audiences, this would place the onus on South Africans themselves to find ways of making this possible. Since this would make it difficult for plays or films to be commercial successes, it would face whites with the choice between culture and money. If they chose money, they would have nobody but themselves to blame.

The Eye of the Needle

The academic boycott. It is particularly difficult to evaluate the impact of the academic boycott. There are two spheres here. By improving what one might call technical education, visiting academics are merely giving whites more skills and confirming their position in the power structure. However, in the sphere of the arts and social sciences, there is at least in some respects the possibility of teaching in a way more directly critical, by showing the liberating potential of social sciences.

Diplomatic pressures. The increasing diplomatic isolation of the South African government has undoubtedly had a positive effect on change in South Africa. This occasionally creeps through in government pronouncements. Dr. Verwoerd made this clear when he introduced the Bantustan policy, which was an advance on pure baasskap; ⁹ it was in part, at least, an attempt to meet foreign pressure. The same applies to Vorster's outward policy and to some instances of internal liberalization that have come along with the outward policy. When such diplomatic pressure comes from the western countries, white South Africa's most likely allies, it is of particular significance.

As far as black Africa is concerned, it is argued that the presence of black diplomats in South Africa and spectacular tours of South Africa by black leaders, like President Banda of Malawi, make useful cracks in the apartheid structure. ¹⁰ The objection to this argument is first that if African states adopt a soft position toward white rule, it is likely to encourage the western states to adopt an even softer one. Second, the proponents of dialogue seem to assume that it is crucial to bring about a change in white attitudes toward blacks. The assumption is that if by talking to white leaders and by parading distinguished and successful blacks in South Africa one can get white South Africans to see that blacks are not as bad as they thought they were, then the whites will give up discrimination and apartheid. But this is obviously an oversimplification of the problem of change in South Africa. As we have seen, black-white relations in South Africa are not merely a question of prejudice; they are also a question of power and exploitation. These three factors interlock: Whites are not willing to change the situation in South Africa, because they enjoy the economic fruits of their monopoly of power and because they still believe that they can hold on to power indefinitely.

Foreign pressure must therefore be evaluated in terms of (1) its effect on actual power relationships; (2) its effect on the whites' confidence in their ability to maintaining power indefinitely; (3) its effect on their beliefs about the consequences of losing power. It is here that their attitudes toward blacks are of great significance.

It is under the second point that the effects of diplomatic pressure are most significant. Isolation from the western block and from military ties with that block, as well as consistent African hostility, can only decrease the white sense of security and hence, I think, increase their willingness to make concessions in response to the growth of power on the part of blacks within South Africa.

Economic sanctions. The same three criteria must be used in evaluating the likely impact of various economic measures. Economic sanctions are the most problematic, both in terms of their likelihood of occurring at all, and in terms of their likely possible impact. I shall consider here the second problem. There are two main alternative strategies: The first is to place pressure on foreign-owned firms in order to get them to improve the conditions of African workers here. The second is to attempt to enforce total withdrawal of foreign investment from South Africa.

Which of these would contribute toward the changing of the power relationships?

Let us assume that either occurred on a significant scale. It might be argued that total withdrawal would create unemployment and political unrest, and at the same time weaken the whites' economic power and so their capacity to hold military and political power. The reformist solution, on the other hand, would strengthen the economy. But it would also provide more blacks with organizational and economic skills.

The Eye of the Needle

Also an expanding economy, although it does not have the automatic rationalizing and antiapartheid effect that some groups believe it to have, nevertheless does, in one important way, as we have seen, strengthen the power of the blacks. The urban blacks have one potential source of power: their organization in trade-unions. The major obstacle to unions up to now has not been their illegality, since in fact they are legal, but rather the existence of very many unemployed and the easy exchangeability of unskilled laborers. An expanding economy, reducing the number of work-seekers by drawing blacks into skilled and semi-skilled jobs, would bring about a situation where an employer could no longer afford not to negotiate with black workers. Thus trade-union organizations and the possibilities of large-scale industrial action are both likely to increase in an expanding economy.

In this perspective, it can be seen that pressure for internal reform can have most effect if it includes, as its absolute minimal demand, the condition that foreign firms should agree to recognize black trade unions, to negotiate with them over wages and conditions of employment and, if necessary, to protect these trade unions from police action. It must be stressed that law does not forbid this; it is the white-owned and foreign-owned firms themselves who have the power to decide whether or not to deal with black trade unions. Unless a system is introduced whereby black workers in the firm are given, through trade-union rights, some real say in determining wages and conditions, the reformist solution remains on the level of paternalistic charity. Also, with only one party, that is, the company, making decisions and possessing information, it will in practice prove impossible to check up on whether firms are actually reforming wages and workers conditions. But the central issue is one of power: Unless some means is provided for giving blacks more power to determine the conditions of their daily lives, programs of reform are virtually meaningless.

What effect would either of these strategies have on the whites' confidence in their ability to continue to maintain power?

It seems to me that the whites' sense of their power is very much tied up with their own particular perceptions of the international situation. They believe, for two reasons, that in the last resort western powers would not permit a black takeover in South Africa. First, white South Africans still perceive the world in terms of a communist conspiracy being fought by the western powers, and they argue that white South Africa is a strong bastion against communism and hence a major factor in the struggle against this worldwide communist conspiracy. As such, it would not be let down by the other anti-communist forces. Second, they believe that the fact of very large-scale British and American investments in South Africa is itself a guarantee that the western powers would, in the last resort, intervene to protect their investments in a revolutionary situation. Thus withdrawals on a significant scale would undoubtedly produce a powerful psychological shock for the whites, and would illustrate far more sharply than the sport boycott the increasing hostility of the world to apartheid. It would be made clear to them that they do not have a friendly power that would intervene to protect them in the last resort, thereby making clear to them the necessity of reaching compromises with growing powerful black groups in South Africa before it is too late. Although economic withdrawal or a refusal to continue investments might slow down economic growth and so slow down the likely indirect political effects of economic growth, it is probable that it would; on the other hand, of itself speed up those political processes and thereby perhaps hasten the desired change.

In evaluating these two contrary arguments, it is also important to try to assess precisely what kind of impact on the economy an ending of foreign investment in South Africa would have. South Africa has already long since passed the take-off stage, and now generates most of its own surplus for capital investment. The percentage of total annual investment that comes from foreign sources varies from year to year, but it is at times as little as 10 percent. Ten percent can of course mean the difference between growth and stagnation, but, on the other hand, it is likely that were investment to be ended, South Africa would retaliate by making repatriation of profits abroad much more difficult, and this money would take the place of at least some of the foreign investment. From this it might be argued that in fact an ending of investments would have no

The Eye of the Needle

impact whatsoever. But this would be incorrect, in the sense that the main advantage which South Africa derives from foreign investment lies not so much in the amount of money made available, but in the high level of skills and technology that are introduced both in the forms of personnel and knowledge. The significance of such high level skills and technology may be that they continue to move South Africa further and further in the direction of a capital-intensive economy. But the ending of investment might not mean so much an ending of growth as rather the necessity of choosing a different strategy for growth. Such strategy would probably be more labor-intensive, hence increasing employment, and would at the same time require a much more rapid development of the skills of African workers if the continued importation of white skilled workers, either in connection with foreign investment or independently by immigration, were to be ended. These considerations mean that we cannot conclude—without a much more detailed study of the nature of the South African economy and the role of foreign investment within that economy than has yet been undertaken—that the ending of foreign investment would in fact have a disadvantageous effect on black employment in South Africa.

One further point that needs to be made about the relationship between investment and employment opportunities in South Africa is that the labor market from which South Africa draws its work force is not limited to the geographical boundaries of South Africa. Large numbers of migrants come from Botswana, Lesotho, and Swaziland, and also from further afield, in Mozambique and even Malawi. There are estimated to be about six hundred thousand such migrant laborers from outside South Africa. It is obvious that such a large influx in relation to the total work force must play some role in keeping the wages down. On the other hand, the territories from which the workers come are in many ways dependent upon this flood of migrant labor and cannot afford simply to stop their workers from going to South Africa. Although some territories, such as Zambia and Tanzania, did do this when they attained independence, they were not so dependent upon migrancy as are countries like Lesotho and Swaziland.

We have seen that the dilemma facing investment is roughly as follows: On the one hand an increase of investment involves an increase in black employment and hence perhaps an increase in potential black bargaining power. On the other hand, the whites benefit disproportionately from investments as they benefit disproportionately from everything else in South Africa, and so, although blacks are made slightly richer, whites are made much richer, and hence much more powerful and able to maintain their repressive system.

For those who claim that they wish to invest in South Africa in order to assist in bringing about social change here, this dilemma can be avoided by the simple mechanism of investing in those countries bordering South Africa, from which South Africa draws large numbers of immigrants. A factory employing five thousand workers in Lesotho draws five thousand workers out of the pool from which South African industry acquires its labor; at the same time, it creates wealth within a black-controlled area, creates taxation which is under the control of a black government, and thereby does nothing at all to strengthen white power in South Africa.

A somewhat similar argument can be made in favor of investments directly within the Bantustans. Investments in these areas, assuming that the Bantustan governments have taxation powers and hence are able to ensure that some of the wealth created is reinvested within the Bantustan areas, would similarly improve the labor situation and at the same time strengthen the economic power of the Bantustan governments. Similarly economic aid for the agricultural development of the homelands would enable them to support a slightly larger population and hence, also, improve the employment situation and strengthen overall black bargaining power. An argument often advanced against such a strategy is that it would be helping to make National Party policy work and that it is therefore bad. This argument is misplaced because, in fact, the National Party policy of separate development cannot work: The Bantustans can never become politically or economically independent entities and the bulk of African workers will always be working in the white-controlled cities. But what the Bantustan development can hope to achieve is to increase

The Eye of the Needle

marginally the bargaining power of African workers in those areas. The development of any black area in South Africa helps to improve the overall position of blacks vis-a-vis whites in the power struggle.

What effect would these alternative strategies have on the whites' attitudes toward Africans?

This is almost impossible to assess. The reformist solution, if it led to an increasing number of black skilled and educated workers in contact with whites, would perhaps help in the decline of prejudice among whites, but this is not at all certain. The withdrawal of investment might increase social tension of various sorts and hence increase prejudice. It might, on the other hand, face whites with the necessity of rapidly re-evaluating their attitudes and hence encourage the decline of prejudice.

The general argument against any form of overseas pressure, that such pressure will lead to a defensive reaction and hence to increased white solidarity, is demonstrably false. There is not enough clarity and certainty of purpose within the governing party for such a reaction to occur. The confusion and debate within white politics is real. But the contrary argument, recently advanced by the U.S. Secretary for African Affairs, David Newsom, that, because whites are now beginning to think about change the pressure should be decreased, is probably false. It is likely that a decrease in external pressure now would mean a decrease in one of the main stimuli that has led to this rethinking.

What is the likelihood of a change in the kind of external pressure now being brought against white dominance in South Africa? This is partly a question of changing attitudes, but it is also very much a question of power relationships among various interest groups in the outside world. From the attitudinal point of view, it would seem reasonable to assume that there will be a continuing decline in race prejudice in the main western bloc countries, but whether this change of attitude gets translated into increasing strong action against white dominance in South Africa is a function of further factors. These western countries all have capitalist sociopolitical systems in which the dominant economic interest groups play a disproportionate role in decision-making, so we have to consider the interests of these groups. The first question is how long some of these groups will consider it to be in their interest to have ties with South Africa. The second question is how long these groups will continue to be dominant within western society. How long will western societies remain essentially capitalist?

The answer to the first question depends upon an analysis of the complex interrelationships on both political and economic levels between Africa, South Africa, and the West, and between power groups within all three of those zones. It might be argued that there will be a gradual long-term shift of interests from South Africa to the rest of Africa. Given its great population, black Africa, even though relatively slow growing, will eventually provide both market and investment opportunities far greater than those available in white-dominated Southern Africa. When such a situation arises, the western powers will have strong economic interests in maintaining friendship with black Africa, even if this has to be done at the expense of existing ties with South Africa. In this case, they might well be willing to support more strongly calls for action against the dominance of whites in South Africa. However this does assume that political leaders in black Africa will have both the will and the power to force western interests to make such a choice. It depends very much on internal political developments in those countries. At present, it seems reasonable to characterize most black African governments as both elitist and neo-colonial in nature. It may well be that rhetorical attacks on white domination in South Africa are strictly for internal consumption only. The ability of black African states to bring to bear both direct pressure on South Africa and indirect pressure on the western bloc depends very much on the extent to which balanced socialist political and economic development replaces the present situation. The possibility of this occurring is in turn, at least in part, dependent upon developments within the major western powers, which exercise a variety of forms of direct and indirect control over development in their neo-colonies. There have been sustained public campaigns against white dominance in Southern Africa in both the United States and Great Britain, and to a lesser extent in a number

The Eye of the Needle

of European countries. But it seems to me unlikely that such campaigns will have any further impact unless there are also changes in social structure in those countries. Strictly speaking, it would probably be possible for the British Parliament or the United States Congress to introduce measures obliging firms registered in those countries either to cease investing in South Africa or else to conform to specific codes that included such things as equal pay for equal work and the recognition of trade-union rights. Factually, however, when these bodies—even if, as in Britain, there is a labor-party majority—have great difficulty in controlling the behavior of corporations within their own territories, it is very unlikely that they would be able to take action on the much less socially salient problem of the behavior of the big corporations in South Africa. The principal source of pressure is the trade-union movement, which could take direct action against firms that behave in ways considered undesirable in South Africa. But the power of the unions is dependent upon the continued development of strong and politically conscious trade unions and on changes in the balance of power between trade unions and capitalists.

ARMED RESISTANCE

I began by arguing that white dominance in South Africa is so militarily entrenched that it cannot possibly be threatened by violent overthrow. However, some of the banned and exiled political organizations have adopted the strategy of guerrilla resistance, and there are guerrilla movements active in other white-dominated territories in Southern Africa. It is therefore necessary to analyze both the military and the symbolic significance of these groups.

In Mozambique, and to a lesser extent in Angola, it is clear that the guerrilla movements have managed to occupy large tracts of territory and to tie down large parts of the Portuguese armed forces. It may well be that some form of military stalemate has now been reached, but even military stalemate is probably more advantageous to the guerrillas than to the Portuguese, since the economy of metropolitan Portugal is not strong. The continuous drain on economic resources as well as the necessity for conscripting Portuguese to do long spells of duty in Africa can hardly help to stabilize the relatively shaky Portuguese regime. Further, Portugal's military reliance on NATO is the most vulnerable element of the whole Southern African white military structure. Although the Portuguese control over Angola and Mozambique is at present fairly complete, it is unlikely that it will remain so for the indefinite future.¹¹

The 5 percent white minority in Rhodesia is also fairly vulnerable to guerrilla activity. It would appear that the guerrilla movement is just beginning to establish itself in some rural areas, and once it is established it only needs to hold on in order to affect drastically the level of morale among whites in Rhodesia and in order to handicap the relatively small military forces that the white Rhodesian regime has available. However given the relative vulnerability of both Portuguese control over Mozambique and white control over Rhodesia, it has been argued that the South African government could be likely to intervene militarily to defend either of those regimes if they were really seriously threatened by guerrilla uprisings. Once more, it is difficult to assess whether this would actually occur, since from the South African government's point of view there are strong arguments both for and against such a measure. Against is the fact that it would dramatically increase outside pressure on South Africa if it were to take such a step; second, South African troops would be placed in a situation where they would have to fight an already entrenched guerrilla force operating in its home territory. Under these circumstances, even great military superiority is often not enough to eliminate the guerrillas and South Africa could therefore find itself involved in a very long and costly war with unpredictable consequences upon the development of the South African economy and South African society itself. The main arguments for the intervention are, first, that if either Rhodesia or Mozambique came under the control of black nationalists, this would immediately threaten South Africa's extensive borders with these two territories, and, second, it would have an enormous negative impact upon white confidence in South Africa while giving a boost to black morale.

The Eye of the Needle

However, even assuming that either or both Rhodesia and Mozambique came under black nationalist control, it is arguable that the real military situation in South Africa itself would not be fundamentally altered. Here the white army would not have to root out an already entrenched guerrilla force, but would have the much easier task of preventing guerrillas from establishing an organizational infrastructure; and the mechanisms of control referred to earlier are probably sufficient for this.

In this case what is the significance of the exiled African National Congress and the Pan African Congress? These bodies have clearly played and continue to play an important role in mobilizing world pressure against white domination in South Africa. But they remain essentially exiled groups and, to judge from a number of recent political trials, have signally failed to establish themselves, or to re-establish themselves, in any way within South Africa itself. Under these circumstances, it is inevitable that there would be a growing alienation of the exiled leadership from past and potential future followers inside South Africa. It is also arguable that the sporadic attempts of the exiles to infiltrate groups in South Africa has an important function in permitting the present government to legitimate a wide variety of oppressive measures in South Africa. In a situation where rapid revolutionary transfer of power is not possible, it may be that groups using the rhetoric of revolution and organizing doomed attempts at insurrection actually play a counterproductive role. They confuse even further the already confused perceptions that the whites have of reality and inhibit the occurrence of fruitful compromises. This result is made more probable when people who cannot possibly be in touch with the day-to-day reality of a continuously changing situation lead them from exile. Nevertheless the existences of these organizations and even of their attempts at infiltration do function as one more visible sign of the essential insecurity of white rule in Southern Africa. It helps to remind whites that their rule is ultimately based on force and that the cost of the continual use of force is likely to be high.

White South Africans are not going to give up power voluntarily, either as a result of lessons in the meaning of race or as a result of lectures on Christian ethics. They are too powerful for power to be simply taken out of their hands. However, their power does not and cannot extend to a total control of the economic and social processes that generate and change the structure of power. As the economic significance of the urban African work force increases, so does the cost of maintaining control of that work force by brute strength. It is in terms of the changing network of power relationships implied by this fact that one has to construct a strategy for bringing about change toward a more just society in South Africa. Even if successful, the rate of change achieved by such a strategy is likely to be slow, and a model of an ideal society must remain a relatively distant hope. But it does have a function, both as a critical tool for analyzing existing social reality and as an ideal that can help to encourage South Africans to work toward a better future.

RICHARD TURNER

February 12, 1973

This is the site where the above information was located: <http://www.sahistory.org.za/pages/library-resources/online%20books/eye-needle/preface.htm>

The Eye of the Needle