

These 8 facts of life must be presented by the U.P. to the white electorate. But it has to present a **ninth** fact of its own. It has decided to work towards a federal constitution and a federal parliament, the powers of which will be allotted to it by the white parliament of "white" South Africa. That in the first place is going to require an amount of co-operation from the other homeland governments of an almost unbelievable kind.

But suppose it is achieved. Then the white parliament must begin to allot yet more powers to the federal parliament, until eventually the transfer of power is complete. The U.P. will go down in history as one of the most extraordinary parties in the history of parliamentary government.

BUT – BUT – BUT –
The white fear!
The gross disparity!
The machinery of apartheid!

One cannot frontally assault the first, but the white parliament that is going to phase itself out must **first** phase out the gross disparity and start dismantling the machinery.

I am convinced that the gross disparity in financial status is one of the deepest causes of white fear and black resentment. The dismantling of apartheid would certainly decrease black resentment. But will it lessen white fear or increase it?

That is a big question. But the important thing is **to be doing, and to be seen to be doing**, something about it.

I wish to make one last point, I believe it is possible to cherish an ideal goal, and to be willing at the same time to pursue it by methods not so ideal, that is by methods one would not have used had one been able to use others. I realise that this causes tensions between young and old, between black and white, between the militants and the dogged sticklers, between the radicals and the liberals, between the all-or-nothings and the all-or-somethings. In fact an all-or-nothing finds it difficult – logically and psychologically – to understand an all-or-something. There is a kind of presumption that an all-or-something has already announced his intentions of settling for a very small something. And there is a kind of nobility accredited to those who take nothing, and a kind of ignobility to those who take something.

If I had a leaning when I was younger, it was to the noble side. I remember Donald Molteno saying to me at a Liberal Party meeting, in that devastating way of his, "the trouble with you, Paton, is that you think the Liberal Party is a church."

But now I'm out to get **something**. I'm out to make white South Africa do **something** (sensible, I mean). I'm out to make everyone who can, do **something**. Therefore I am out to make the U.P. do **something**.

All that I can say to them is, do it quickly. Otherwise violence and death will be the destiny of many of us, both black and white, many of us yet not born.□

Alan Paton

FEDERATION

by Leo Marquard

I should like to congratulate and thank those responsible for calling this conference. If anything is to become of the much-talked about federation it is at such conferences as this that ideas will have to be sorted out before they are presented to the public – that is, to 14 or 15 million adult South Africans.

The word 'federation' is very much in the air these days, and I mean that in both senses: it is being talked about a good deal in rather limited circles, and the talk is often divorced from reality. This is the result, I think, of the rather loose conceptions of federation that are current. I have an uncomfortable feeling that it has become fashionable to throw off remarks at cocktail parties that, of course, what we really need is federation. more often than not with the

(Paper read at the Conference on Federation, held near East London on the 9th November 1973.)

corollary that this will fix the Nationalists or possibly even the United Party. It is rather like a doctor saying to a banned person whose passport has been taken from him: 'What you really need is to get away from South Africa for a long holiday. Why not go to the Riviera?'. Alternatively, of course, you can establish yourself as an up-to-date authority by saying, possibly even at the same cocktail party: 'Of course it's quite absurd. Federation has never worked anywhere else and it certainly won't work here.'

The reason why the feeling I have about this superficial attitude is uncomfortable is that, as you all know, federation is not going to come about merely as the result of a change of government or of a slight shift in white political power or of sloans. There is nothin' 'mere' about what is required

before a federation can be brought about. And unless it is recognised that it is going to be a long and hard job we shall fail to take even the first step, which is to bring the idea of federation into the sphere of public consciousness and thus of practical politics.

It is because I believe that federation, properly understood, could be a useful constitutional device in South Africa's circumstances that I think it is important to be clear about what we mean by it. I suggest the straightforward definition that it is a system of government best suited to those **who desire union but do not want unity**. And federation will come about only when people believe that it is both useful and safe.

It is hardly necessary to say that South Africa is essentially a country in which federation would be more appropriate for all the inhabitants than either of the two alternatives of total partition or total union. The conditions that make it so are its diverse population with great differences of race, language, history and culture; its divergent climatic regions and **great** geographic distances; and its diverse economic conditions.

Not only is South Africa – and, indeed, Southern Africa an area where federation is an appropriate form of government: these conditions have, after all, always been there. But, so it seems to me, conditions have never been so favourable for fruitful discussion about it. The main reason for this is the very general realisation that South Africa's race policies are rapidly reaching the end of the road. What we are now experiencing is the logical outcome of generations of those policies which, during the past twentyfive years, have gone under the general name of apartheid. And the logical consequences of apartheid are not pleasant to contemplate. That is why more and more people are seeking alternatives.

I don't want to be misunderstood when I say that the fear of worsening racial disharmony is a powerful factor in inducing South Africans of all races to seek an escape. I do not regard federation as a means of solving race questions or dissolving race prejudice and I do not advocate it for that reason. But it could provide a constitutional framework within which such questions may find more rational answers.

Incidentally, there seems to be an idea abroad that there is something ignoble, almost dishonest in acting under the spur of fear. This seems to me to be nonsense and I hope advocates of federation will not for one instant allow this to deter or inhibit them.

It would take a lot of hard, clever, and honest propaganda to persuade the people of South Africa that, in theory at any rate, federation would be a good thing. But it is not, I believe, impossible to do so. A much bigger snag comes in the second part of my definition. You can persuade South Africans that federation is useful. But can you convince them that it is safe? How do you set about persuading the Zulu and the Xhosa that federation is not just the latest model of colonial exploitation? How do you convince Afrikaners that their language and culture will be

safer under federation than they are now, when political power, however illusory, is in Afrikaner hands? .

* * * * *

I am not going even to suggest answers. That is, after all, what this conference is about. But I would like to make a few observations.

In the first place, let us not fall into the trap of expecting federation to do what it never was designed to do. It is not designed to rid society of race prejudice, to abolish greed and the exploitation of the weak by the strong. It is not designed to ensure either weak or strong central or local government. In other words, federation is not a social or political panacea. It is not a super washing machine into which you can put all your dirty political and economic linen and expect to have it come out clean and shiny.

In the second place, while it is of great advantage not to be dogmatic about any federal arrangements that are suggested, it is important to realise that there are three essential principles in federation: the division of sovereign powers, the special function of the supreme court, and the machinery for constitutional amendment. Any plans for federation should be measured against these three principles. If they are violated or even watered down and weakened, the result will almost certainly be a pernicious distortion of federation.

Finally, let us, black and white together, not underestimate the immensity of the task of persuading black and white that federation is sound and safe. Nor, at the same time, let us shrink from it.

This conference may not be the beginning of the end; but as Churchill said, it might well be the end of the beginning. And to quote another great man, Albert Luthuli, who once said to me: ' It doesn't matter how fast the car goes so long as it's going in the right direction.'□

