



mei

1976

may

BY DIE POSKANTOOR AS NUUSBLAD INGESKRYF

REGISTERED AT THE GPO AS A NEWSPAPER

pro veritate

GOD IS 'N „ONS-MOMENT”

God is 'n „ons-moment”. Dié frase is op 'n stuk rofwerkpapier teen 'n muur by een van die naweekstudiegroepe geskryf. Dit is gedoen met die gedagte van 'n eksistensiële treffer en nie soseer as 'n presiese teologiese stelling nie, maar dit is 'n goeie gedagte wat uit die Skrif kom en wat die kors van immuniteit tot waarheid, wat die ou familiariteit van die gewone terme op ons gelê het, deurdring. Jesus het dit eenvoudig gestel.

„Waar twee of drie in my Naam vergader, daar is Ek by hulle.” Gedurende die afgelope jare het mense groot moeite gedoen om die idee dat God „daarbo” in die hemel, „daarbuite” in die ruimte of „daarbinne” in die kerk is, te veroordeel. Hier gee Jesus 'n positiewe lokalisasie van sy teenwoordigheid waar 'n baie klein groepie op sy manier in diepte ontmoet. In die diepe meedelende kennis van mekaar, in die aanvaarding van ander en in die gee van jouself aan ander, in 'n ontmoeting in liefde, as „ek” en „jy” werklik „ons” word — daar is God werklik besig om in krag, wysheid en liefde te werk. As jy in iemand se oë kyk en 'n „ons-moment” is voortgebring, is God aktief.

Twee- of driehonderd kan nie hierdie diepte ken nie, alhoewel groepe binne die massa dit kan ken. Mense wat mekaar fisies ontmoet, maar geskeie bly as gevolg van vrees, hoogmoed of gierigheid, wat gemeenskap verhinder, kan dit nie ken nie. Mense wat mekaar in die naam van vyandskap, selfsug, vernietiging of korrupsie ontmoet, kan dit nie ken nie. Maar almal wat Hom aangeeem het, wat hulle toewyding aan hom geskenk het, aan hulle het Hy die mag gegee om kinders van God te word ... en die Woord het vlees geword en onder ons kom woon.

Dit is 'n faktor van uiterste belang in ons moderne samelewing.

doeltreffendheid

Die leierskapsgroepe wat probeer en wat faal om ons beskawing te lei, is rondom twee faktore gesentreer: doeltreffendheid en vrees.

Die samelewing is nie gemotiveer om mense te help nie, maar om 'n doeltreffende samelewing te wees. Dit is gebaseer op goeie besigheidsmetodes en funksioneer met agendas eerder as met agape. Ons het so 'n obsessie om doeltreffende sisteme te laat funksioneer dat ons nooit daaraan dink dat die beskawing veronderstel is om vir *mense* te bestaan nie. Etensuurafsprake, kantoortyptjies, kerklike uitstappies en politieke vergaderings word gehou om die doeltreffendheid van ons organisasies te verbeter. Wat 'n gekheid! As ons vergeet dat ons organisasies bedoel is om mense behulpsaam te wees en nie andersom nie, is ons prioriteite verkeerd om.

Die blanke westerse samelewing is so geïndoktrineer met hierdie tyd-wins-bekwaamheid-sindroom dat

alleenlik 'n lang diepgaande proses van blanke bewuswordingsontwikkeling dit sal red. Die meeste van ons glo eerlik dat dit belangriker is om tyd aan besigheid as aan menseverhoudings te wy; geld is sukses; werk moet eerste kom; ons beplan ons dag om soveel werk soos moontlik gedaan te kry; ons gryp 'n toebroodjie by ons lessenaars vir middagete: ons verafsku onderbrekings, ontplof as mense laat is en uiter verwensings oor „Afrikatyd”. Ons is diensknegte van 'n pragtige gladgeoliede sosiale masjien wat „ons wyse van lewe” genoem word, en ons benodig dringend die transformerende vriendskap van swart menslikheid.

Kerke is veronderstel om Jesus te volg en hulle het kolossale godsdienstige organisasies met reuse geboue, programme en personeel opgebou: Hý het dit by eetpartye gedoen.

vrees

Die ander sindroom van ons leierskapsiekte is vrees. Ons is jaloers oor ons afgebakende terrein, afgunstig op wins en prestige en sien ander as 'n bedreiging van ons bestaan. Hierdie vrese word uitgedruk in 'n gees van suspisie, antagonisme en aggressie teenoor ander wat dan 'n skeiding tussen die „ons-heid” in alle menseverhoudings bewerkstellig. Dit is so sterk dat ons dit gebruik om ons verkeerdheid te verdedig.

Vrees het die regering aangepor om skeiding tussen mense eerder as die essensiële eenheid te beklemtoon, en dit belas die land met 'n ongelooflike uitgawe aan Afsonderlike Ontwikkeling, wat alles in verregaande stryd met die evangelie van Christus is.

Kerklikes wat hulle verskillende tradisies en magsbasse meer as hulle broederlike liefde vertroetel, het die kerk irrelevant gemaak en die ekumene 'n verbygaande fase.

Solank bevrydingsgroepe meer daarop ingestel is om skimpe na mekaar te slinger, eerder as om ondersteunende groepe te wees wat Christelike bevryding saam najaag, sal hulle geen ware oorwinning ken nie.

Rugsteekkompetisie vir werk binne partye, 'n ekonomie wat op liefde vir geld gebou is, 'n beskawing wat aan grootheid toegewy is, is alles 'n toonbeeld van vrees en mislukking.

'n nuwe klimaat benodig

Ons benodig die totstandkoming van 'n klimaat in menseverhoudings wat mense eerste stel; wat probeer om te verstaan eerder as om te verwerp; wat 'n instink het om saam te werk eerder as om te opponeer; wat reageer met 'n natuurlike vriendskap in plaas van kompetisie; wat prestasie eerder as beskerming najaag; wat op prys stel eerder as om te beklad; wat optree en reflekteer eerder as om te beplan en te welfel; wat positief eerder as negatief

is; en wat deur hoop en vasberade liefde eerder as vrees beheer word. Ons benodig 'n „ons-heid“.

Die fundamentele veranderinge wat gedurende hierdie jare in Suid-Afrika plaasvind, sal geweldige voordeel van so 'n verandering in klimaat ondervind. Aangesien die blanke regering klaarblyklik daarop ingestel is om swart bevryding met al die mag waartoe hy instaat is, te verhinder, is dit alleenlik so 'n verandering in die morele klimaat wat 'n katastrofe uit die weg kan ruim.

Hoe kan ons dit bekom en hoe kan ons dit betyds bekom?

Ons moet dit aanvaar dat die kerke en die Raad van Kerke, of die politieke partye en die parlement nie in staat is om betyds so 'n verandering in die klimaat van die land te bewerkstellig nie. Hulle organisasies en persoonlikhede is te swaar belas met sisteme wat verandering verhinder om die leiers daarvan te wees. Hulle motiewe verskil ook. In die een geval wil hulle partye organiseer en in die ander geval kerke, en in geen geval is daar genoeg mense wat gewillig is om die nodige ingrypende veranderinge aan te bring om nou 'n *samelewing* vir mense te skep nie. Elkeen wat vir leiding van bo wag- is dwaas- lui of blind vir die weg waarlangs God werk. Ons moet na onself kyk.

gewone mense

As verandering kom, sal dit kom omdat gewone manne en vroue dit bewerkstellig. „Waar twee of drie ...”

So 'n verandering in die benadering tot die lewe is nou heeltemal moontlik, maar dit ontstaan by manne en vroue wat 'n „ons-heid” in hulle persoonlike verhoudings gevind het en wat gevolglik weet dat dit moontlik is. So 'n klimaat kan nie van bo af afgedwing word nie: dit moet vanuit die bodem ontstaan.

As iemand anders nie die leiding neem nie, moet u dit neem. As u diep besorg is oor Christelike verandering en u kan geen weg vind waarop dit in u lewe kan plaasvind nie, kom saam met een of twee ander wat u besorgdheid deel. Dit kan u familie, u kring, u kerk, u werk, u ras wees, of stel die vraag aan iemand in 'n ander groep. Begin met 'n span en begin om mekaar baie goed te leer ken. Natuurlik is dit 'n uitdaging. As u dink dat u en 'n paar vriende kan gaan sit en deur u eie ondervinding 'n krag, wysheid en liefde kan ontdek waardeur God 'n groot oorwinning met betrekking tot die bevryding van Afrika kan behaal, sal dit sekerlik uitdagend wees.

En natuurlik is u alreeds so besig.

Besig waarmee?

EDITORIAL

GOD IS AN US-MOMENT

God is an us-moment. The phrase was scrawled on some wall-hung newsprint at a group study weekend with more thought for its existential astuteness than its theological exactitude but it is a good thought, arising from scripture, piercing the crust of immunity to truth which long familiarity with the usual jargon has laid upon us. Jesus said it simply.

‘Where two or three have met together in my name, I am there among them.’ People have gone to great lengths in recent years to denounce the idea that God is ‘up there’ in heaven, ‘out there’ in space, or ‘in there’ in church, and here Jesus gives a positive location of his presence when a very small group meet at a depth in his way. In the deep sharing knowledge of one another, in the acceptance of others and the giving of yourself to them, in the devoting of true selves to a common goal beyond yourselves, in a meeting in love, when ‘me’ and ‘you’ become truly ‘us’ — there God is operating in power and wisdom and love. When you look into someone else’s eyes and an us-moment is forged, God is acting.

Two or three hundred cannot know this depth, although groups within the crowd may know it. People who meet physically, but remain separated by fear, pride or greed that prevent togetherness cannot know it. People who meet together in the name of hostility, selfishness, destruction or corruption cannot know it. ‘But to

all who received him, to those who have yielded him their allegiance, he gave the right to become children of God ... so the Word became flesh and dwelt among us.’

This is a factor of vital importance to modern society.

efficiency

The leadership groups which are attempting and failing to lead our civilisation are centred on two factors: efficiency and fear.

Society is not motivated to help people, but to be an efficient society. It is based on good business procedures rather than good personal relationships and runs on agendas rather than agape. We are so totally obsessed with running efficient systems that it never occurs to us that civilisation is supposed to be for *people*. Lunch dates, office parties, church outings, and political rallies are held in order to improve the effectiveness of our organisations! What craziness! ‘When we forget that organisations are meant to help people, instead of the other way round, our priorities are upside down.

White western society is so indoctrinated with this time-profit-efficiency syndrome that only a long hard process of white conscientisation will save it. Most of us honestly believe it is more important to give time to business than to human relationships; money is success; work must come first; we plan our days to fit in as much

work as possible, grab a sandwich at our desks for lunch, abhor interruptions, fume when people are late, and growl imprecations about 'African time'. We are servants of a beautiful streamlined social machine called our 'way of life' and we desperately need the transforming friendship of black human-ness.

Churches are supposed to follow Jesus, and have built up colossal religious organisations with vast buildings, programmes, and personnel: he did it at supper parties.

fear

The other syndrome of our leadership disease is fear. We are jealous of our tramping grounds, covetous of profit and prestige, and see others as a threat to our existence. These fears are expressed in a spirit of suspicion, antagonism, and aggression towards others which plants a barrier against 'us-ness' in all human relationships. It is so strong that we use it to defend our wrongness.

Fear has prompted Government to emphasise the division between people rather than their essential unity, and burden the country with the incredible expenditure on Separate Development, all in flagrant confrontation with the Christian gospel.

Churchmen who cherish their different traditions and power bases more than their brotherhood have made the church irrelevant, and ecumenism a passing phase.

Whilst liberation groups are more concerned to be different groups throwing gibes at one another, than in being supportive groups seeking Christian liberation together, they will know no real victory.

Cut throat competition for jobs within parties, an economy built on the love of money, a civilisation dedicated to bigness, are all demonstrably fearful — and failing.

new climate needed

We need the establishment of a climate in human relationships that puts people first; that seeks to understand rather than reject; that has an instinct to cooperate rather than oppose; that responds with a natural friendship instead of rivalry; that seeks achievement rather than protection; that praises rather than denigrates; that acts and reflects rather than plans and vacillates; that is positive rather than negative; and is ruled by hope and determined love, rather than fear. We need an 'us-ness'.

The fundamental changes taking place in Southern Africa during these years would benefit enormously from such a change in climate. Indeed, since the white Government is obviously bent on preventing black liberation with all the force at its command, it is only such a change in the moral climate that can obviate catastrophe.

How can we get it, and how can we get it in time?

We must accept that neither the churches and the Council of Churches, nor the political Parties and the Parliament are capable of bringing such a change in the climate of the country in time. Their organisations and personalities are too heavily weighted with systems that prevent change to be the leaders of it. Their motives are different. In one case they want to run parties, and in the other to run churches, and in neither are there enough people who are willing to make the profound changes necessary to make a society for people now. Anyone who waits for a lead from above is foolish, lazy, or blind to the way God works. We must look to ourselves.

ordinary people

If change is to come it will, because ordinary men and women bring it. 'Where two or three ...' Such a change in the approach to life is perfectly possible now, but it arises from men and women who have found an 'us-ness' in their personal relationships, and thus know it is possible. Such a climate cannot be imposed from the top; it must arise at the graasroots.

Where someone else does not take the lead, then *you* must do it. If you are deeply concerned for Christian change and find no way for it to happen in the present structures of your life, get together with one or two others with whom you may share your concern. It can be your family, your circle, your church, your work, your race or raise the question with someone in another group. Set up a team, and start getting to know one another in depth.

Of course, it is challenging. When you think that you and a couple of friends can sit down and discover in your own experience a power and wisdom and love through which God can win a great victory in the liberation of Africa, it is bound to be challenging.

And, of course, you are so busy already.

Busy at what?

WHITE DARK

I sit by the White bed
Of my White child
Savaged by a White dog
Being dazed by his bandaged sight,
And I read
Black Gatsha's words
In Black and White
To
And I ask
Is it he will smite
The Moses Rock —
Release from the White dark,
Deep draught of the Black heart?

— E.C.

ARE SOME WARS JUST?

james moulder

Some conscientious objectors refuse to submit to every kind of combat training whatsoever. On the other hand, there are conscientious objectors who refuse to submit to combat training only if they are convinced that the war in which they are required to fight is unjust. They argue that everyone has an obligation to employ just means to make situations more just. And so they conclude that the more apparent it is that the war in which he is being asked to participate is just, the less convincing is a conscientious objector's refusal to participate in it.

This kind of argument has a long history. For example, it occurs in Augustine's influential reflections on the moral problems which are raised by war.¹ And it is this tradition which lies behind an argument which can be extracted from the Hammanskraal statement on conscientious objection:

1. Both Catholic and Reformation theology has regarded the taking up of arms as justifiable, if at all, only in order to fight a "just war".
2. The theological definition of a "just war" excludes war in defence of a basically unjust and discriminatory society.
3. The Republic of South Africa is at present a fundamentally unjust and discriminatory society.
4. Therefore, the SACC calls on its member Churches to challenge all their members to consider becoming conscientious objectors.

Everyone does have an obligation to employ just methods to make situations more just. And so this argument threatens to undermine those conscientious objectors who refuse to submit to every kind of combat training whatsoever. On the other hand, it is not clear that this argument is sound. More specifically, it assumes that we have a set of impartial tests which can be used to discover whether or not a war is just. But this assumption is problematic for at least four reasons. No government recognises the theory of a just war. There are too many conflicting versions of the theory. The theory raises more questions than it answers. And the theory cannot be applied.

No government recognises the theory

No government has ever announced that it has assessed the situation in which it finds itself and come to the conclusion that the war which it is waging- or about to wage, is unjust. On the contrary, during a war a government is always convinced that it has justice on its side.

There are too many conflicting versions of the theory

Conscientious objectors who appeal to a theory of a just war need to explain why they have adopted one version of the theory rather than another. And they owe us this explanation because there are so many conflicting versions of the theory. For example, Francis Wilson has argued that a war is just if, and only if, each of the following six conditions hold:²

The war must be waged by a legitimate authority; and for a just cause. The war must be as limited as possible; and all other methods of resolving the dispute must have already been tried. There must be reason to believe that the war will not be unduly prolonged; and that after the war conditions will be better than before it began.

On the other hand, Willem de Klerk's theory of a just war does not require one to believe 'that the war will not be unduly prolonged; and that after the war conditions will be better than before it began'.³ And so someone who chose Wilson's tests for a just war would find it easier to justify his refusal to submit to combat training than someone who chose de Klerk's.

Unfortunately, this disagreement over what counts as a just war is not confined to South Africans. Here are two examples:

(a) John Rawls insists that a war is just only if a nation has just institutions which it wants to preserve.⁴ John Calvin, however, argues that a nation may wage a just war not only 'to preserve the tranquility of their dominion' but also 'to help those forcibly oppressed'.⁵

(b) Thomas Aquinas requires a war to be waged by a legitimate authority before it can count as a just war.⁶ But Jacques Ellul does not insist on this test.⁷ And so he allows for the possibility that a civil war may be just.

And so one could continue.⁸ But enough has been said to demonstrate that there are too many conflicting versions of the theory. And so, any conscientious objector who appeals to a theory of a just war to support his refusal to submit to combat training needs to explain why he has chosen one theory rather than another.

The theory raises more questions than it answers

All the theories which have been discussed are so vague that they do not provide us with a set of impartial tests which can be applied to discover whether or not a war is just. What they do instead is to raise more questions than they answer.

Firstly, it is impossible to apply these tests because they do not provide us with an objective standard of injustice.

Secondly, they do not overcome the problem of who is to decide whether or not any of the parties to the dispute satisfy all the conditions which the theory stipulates.

Finally, what counts as a legitimate authority? When are we in a position from which it is clear that all other means of resolving the dispute have already been tried? How does one prevent an aggressive nation from employing negotiations and other efforts for a peaceful settlement to give itself more time to prepare for the eventual war? And how long must a war last before it counts as a war which is unduly prolonged?

None of these questions is new.⁹ And none of them has been satisfactorily answered. It is therefore difficult to defend a refusal to submit to combat training if one appeals to a theory of a just war.

The theory cannot be applied

Even if all the parties to a particular conflict are prepared to adopt the same tests for a just war; and even if all the questions which the theory generates have been answered to everyone's satisfaction, it is still impossible to apply them to a war which is about to be waged or is actually being waged. And this is impossible because a theory of a just war can be applied only if both sides disclose a fairly substantial set of facts about the whole situation both before and during the war. But no government allows this kind and amount of information to be disclosed to the public. And so no conscientious objector can

ever be in a position to say whether or not a particular set of tests has been satisfied. It is not surprising, therefore, that no government has ever adopted a theory of a just war to regulate its decisions about war. Even if it did, it could not disclose the information on which it based its decision.

All these considerations add up to reasonable grounds for the claim that we do not have, and are unlikely ever to have, an adequate theory of a just war. In fact, the best we may be able to hope for is a theory which demonstrates that we are never in a position to say that a war is just. But be that as it may. What is clear is that conscientious objectors who appeal to a theory of a just war are building on sand. And so are those people who use a theory of a just war to defend the military activities of their government.

1. *The City of God*, chapter 19.
2. *South African Outlook*, 104, 1974, page 122.
3. *Die Transvaler*, 6 September 1974.
4. *A Theory of Justice*, Oxford University Press, 1973, page 379.
5. *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, iv, 22, 11-12.
6. *Summa Theologiae*, 2a2ae, question 40.
7. *Violence*, SCM Press, 1970, page 6.
8. Compare John Macquarrie's *The Concept of Peace*, SCM Press, 1973 and Ralph Potter's *War and Moral Discourse*, John Knox Press, 1973.
9. See R.H. Bainton's *Christian Attitudes to War*, Abingdon Press, 1960.

RESPONSIBLE LIBERATION

c.f. beyers naudé

(Address to J'ACCUSE, Holland on the 4th May, 1975).
(English Translation of Dutch Text).

* * * * *

Mr. Chairman, Members of the Foundation, Honoured Guests, Ladies and Gentlemen, in conveying to you my sincere gratitude for the invitation extended to me to address you tonight I regret that I cannot be present to deliver this address owing to the fact that I do not possess a passport. As is probably known to you I have already twice applied for my passport to come to Europe since December 1974 when it was withdrawn but without success. When I received your invitation in March of this year I was uncertain whether I should make another attempt, knowing that one of my colleagues and ex-staff member of the Christian Institute, Rev. Roelf Meyer, who had already resigned as staff member of the Christian Institute and as Editor of *Pro Veritate* in December 1975, was waiting in tension to obtain a reply from the Government to his application for a passport to Holland to further his theological studies and because I did not wish to do anything to jeopardize his application. It was his sincere hope that he would receive his passport. When in the first week of April he was officially notified that his application was refused I had reluctantly to conclude that there was no point in my again applying at this point in time.

And yet I felt myself urged to respond to your urgent request with the result that I have taped my address for your use as you may decide. I do it in the first place because I wish to address you from within our South African situation over the theme: Responsible Liberation from Oppression, but also in the second place because I wish to express my solidarity with the aim of your Foundation namely to accuse Neo-fascism as well as Neo-Stalinism. For any overseas audience with a basic awareness of my religious as well as of my political convictions it is in fact unnecessary to state the following but because I am constantly being accused in my own country of being a communist or of unwittingly promoting communism through my actions, I regard it to be necessary once more to state my strong opposition against any form of totalitarianism — regardless of whether this originates from the right or the left.

But I have to go further: I am obliged to point out that South

Africa, because of its continued relentless efforts to implement the policy of Separate Development (formerly known as the policy of Apartheid) has developed into a refined totalitarian state. South Africa prides itself on being a Christian country which fully subscribes to the principles of democracy. When somebody however, tests our racial policies against Christian principles and democratic norms he quickly discovers that these policies could never pass the test of Christian principles and that in our political practice very little remains of democracy as such. All the most important regulations which a police state requires to function efficiently are to be found on our statute book.

S.A. Unwittingly Furthering the Aims of Communism

Furthermore we proudly claim to be the most outspoken anti-communist state in the world, whilst we as Whites through our racial policies offer the most fertile soil for the promotion of communism. If, added to this, practically every outspoken active advocate for racial justice in South Africa is termed a communist or is being charged under the Act of the Suppression of Communism, is it surprising that increasingly the Black community of South Africa comes to the conclusion that communism must be something very good?

This positive evaluation of communist ideology has in the past year received a tremendous boost through South Africa's initial intervention and her subsequent withdrawal from Angola with the triumphant role which Russian armour and Cuban troops played to provide the victory to the MPLA. The possibility that Russian military support could also lead to a similar victory to SWAPO in Namibia and for the ANC in Rhodesia (Zimbabwe), cannot be excluded. Is it therefore surprising that a substantial percentage of the Black people of South Africa direct their hopes and expectations for liberation on Russia and Russian weapons?

Another factor which further complicated the situation is the sudden big interest of the United States of America in Africa, of Kissinger's whirlwind-visit to Southern Africa and his seemingly serious warnings to Rhodesia as well as to South Africa. The Blacks of South Africa are not being misled! so easily by the impression that has been created; that the U.S.A. is primarily concerned about the liberation of the suppressed Black masses of South Africa, Namibia or Rhodesia. Many of

them state with an understandable cynicism: if it had not been for Russia's intervention in Africa then America's concern for racial justice would have remained what it previously was: a pious expression of empty words and resolutions. Thus again the conclusion drawn by Blacks: that only when Russia intervenes something positive in favour of their liberation emerges.

White Sense of False Security

On the White side, however, a totally different situation is to be found — another proof of the tremendous difference in outlook between these two groups. Instead of being prepared as a White population to realise the disastrous effect which the continual implementation of our racial policies and of White domination has to permanently destroy all trust which Blacks still had in the Whites, Government propaganda has succeeded in letting Whites believe that with Vorster's detente policy in Africa and with the marginal changes in South Africa which were announced with such a fanfare of trumpets, meaningful changes have occurred — whereas in fact from the Black view point nothing has changed. In effect censorship has in the meantime increased, the number of people in detentions increase from day to day, the number of persons arrested under the Terrorism Act increases from week to week, whilst the Whites are living under the dangerous illusion that the situation is proceeding at a fairly normal rate. Is it therefore surprising that the polarisation between Black and White is increasing daily, that frustration and bitterness in the hearts of the younger Black generation increases rapidly and that the practically unanimous conviction is held within the Black community that the White political and economic reign will never voluntarily relinquish its existing rights and privileges or bring about any fundamental change. "Our liberation can now only come from above" is the view of the decreasing number of religious believers. "Our liberation could now only come from within or from without" is the view of the increasing number of politically awakened younger set.

"Destroying a Birthright"

And instead of the White population calling a halt to its racial policies and saying that it is in their own highest interests as a White group to come to an open dialogue with the genuine leaders of the Black community in a round table convention, the Government is relentlessly pursuing its racial policies with an unbelievable lack of sensitivity. The most recent proof of this is the emerging Independence of the Transkei on the 26th October and everything which relates thereto. Approximately 1 million Xhosa's are residing and working outside of the Transkei. The South African Government has announced that all Xhosa-speaking Black South Africans will on the 26th October automatically gain a Transkein citizenship and that simultaneously their South African citizenship would be withdrawn, whereas Kaiser Matanzima has totally rejected this view point and maintains that every Xhosa outside the Transkei should have the choice of whether he wishes to be a citizen of the Transkei or of South Africa. In a leading article under the title "Destroying a birthright" Dean Desmond Tutu, Black Anglican Dean of the diocese of Johannesburg and Bishop elect of Lesotho, in an expression of deep concern but with praise worthy self-discipline, writes as follows:

"Blacks are being provoked beyond human endurance. Do you really want peaceful change or does the fact that you have so much military power and so many sophisticated arms mean you don't care what the Black man's reaction will be.

Do you want to make us really desperate? I have warned

before and I reiterate this warning with all seriousness that desperate people will be compelled to use desperate means.

We are going to be free, genuinely free, all of us White and Black together in a genuinely free South Africa. Nothing, and I repeat nothing, will eventually stop us becoming free.

Dear White South Africans we want you to have a stake in South Africa and to remain here so that we can go forward together in a united South Africa, not one that is balkanised into unviable bits of things that are the figment of somebody's imagination.

We don't want violence, we don't want death and destruction.

We want peace, justice and order.

We are human-beings and do believe this for your own sakes. We don't want a bloody confrontation. I mean this with all my heart.

Please do not provoke us into despair and hopelessness. Please for God's sake."

In these words we hear the moving plea of a deeply sincere and concerned Black Christian leader to the conscience of the Whites — perhaps for the last time.

If such a passionate appeal for change in attitude and political practice does not bring about any essential change, what then remains?

Developing a War-psychosis

Instead of responding to such a serious warning it seems to me that the White population, under the influence of the successful Government propaganda over television, radio and in the press, is increasingly developing a war-psychosis and a spirit of aggressive militarism. I am referring here especially to the release and presentation of a television programme on the evening of the 30th April entitled: Slag om Brug 14 in which a portrayal was given of a number of White South African soldiers killing between 150 and 200 Cuban troops in Angola in December — and the tremendous publicity which this received in the press and over the radio. It gives the impression of the Government and the army wishing to tell the Whites: "You have nothing to fear — our strength lies in military power and violence." Does White South Africa not realise that reacting to this powerful display of violence many Blacks are saying in their hearts: it now seems that for us there is no other way open than to seek forms of counter-violence.

It sometimes seems as if the White population is affected with a blindness which makes it unable or unwilling to see and with a deafness which makes it unable or unwilling to hear and that we are beginning to witness the unfolding of a Greek tragedy before our eyes which could bring incalculable harm and sorrow to millions of people in Southern Africa. If one expresses such a thought many Whites react vehemently by saying: But what do you expect of us? What should White South Africa do to prevent a violent confrontation and yet to insure the future of the White community?

Seven Crucial Steps

The answer to this question I, as well as a number of leaders of the Christian Institute, have repeatedly given so clearly that I see no point in an extensive repetition thereof here. But I regard it of great importance at this crucial period of South Africa's existence to emphasise the seven basic issues of importance:

1. The 4½ million Whites of South Africa have to except the fact of the permanence of 9 million Africans, 2½ million

Coloureds and 3/4 million Asians in so called White South Africa and to face the implications of this permanence.

2. The White population should accept the principle that this Black and Brown majority should be given a meaningful share in the political power structure of South Africa as well as a substantially greater participation in the economic riches of our country.
3. In order to implement the above recommendation it is urgently required that a National Convention on a broad basis should be held as soon as possible and that Black national leaders such as Mandela and Sobukwe should also be allowed to participate.
4. Property rights should be given to Africans as soon as possible.
5. The existing pass laws should be repealed and substituted for a labour ruling which would have to be approved by the Black leadership.
6. Compulsory and free education for all children between the ages of 6 and 16 years should be instituted without any delay.
7. All legislation which allows, sanctions or approves of discrimination on the basis of race or colour should be repealed.

Whoever maintains that the above recommendations are impossible to implement in practice is in fact stating: I prefer bloodshed and violence to fundamental peaceful change.

Guidelines for Change

There is one further question which I have to answer this evening. Time and again the question is being put from Holland to us in South Africa: What could the people of the Netherlands do? I wish to emphasise that it is not possible to give an "Instant" reply but I feel urged to convey to you as clearly as possible seven basic suggestions which could act as guidelines to all those who wish to participate in a process of meaningful peaceful change.

1. Reject every form of racism wherever it might occur — in your own country, in South Africa and in the whole world. Combat it with all the power at your disposal as an evil which has to be eradicated from the face of the earth.
2. Give your whole-hearted support to all actions, programmes and projects of radical peaceful change in Southern Africa which have been called into being through Black initiative.
3. Ensure that White immigration to South Africa be terminated as long as Black and White in South Africa have not obtained equal rights and opportunities and as long as the majority of the population is not free to express its conviction over the issue of immigration.
4. The Netherlands Government and the Netherlands people should know that any political support which Holland might provide to grant international recognition to any Bantu Homeland moving into Independence, will reduce your credibility in the eyes of the authentic leadership of the Black community to a minimum.
5. Regarding foreign investments it is generally known that there is a difference of opinion within the Black community. Increasingly the conviction of the more radical group is gaining ground which states the view-point that all further investment should be terminated until equitable political rights have been granted to the Blacks. Others, however, believe that such a step would be more detrimental to the

Blacks. The final decision could only be given by a broad representation of the Black community — and I sincerely hope that such a decision will be given as soon as possible. But in the meantime there is complete unanimity amongst Blacks that:

- Immediate legal recognition should be given to Black Trade Unions (including the right to strike).
- Equal pay for equal work should be given.
- Promotion should be given on merit and not on grounds of race or colour.

The least which foreign investors in South Africa could thus do is to ensure that these minimum requirements should be implemented. And if this does not happen then to state to South Africa: We do not participate any longer.

6. The number of people requiring legal aid as a result of their involvement in the struggle for liberation is increasing daily. Therefore it is of vital importance that you subscribe to the right of protest as well as to the important legal principle that an accused is regarded to be innocent until he has been proved guilty. The number of political trials in our courts of law in which the leadership or members of the Black Peoples' Convention (BPC), SASO, SWAPO, NAYO, NUSAS and others are involved in South Africa as well as in Namibia is increasing from month to month. I deeply regret that these trials require such extensive financial expenditure but at the same time I am convinced that the western world should do everything in its power also to express in this way its solidarity with the oppressed.

7. It should be clear to every objective observer that the White community of South Africa is not able to effect the fundamental changes in the political and the economic structure of our country which will satisfy the valid and reasonable demands of the Black community. Therefore only one of two possibilities remain open:

Either the Black community, supported by countries of the world community, exercises responsible peaceful pressure on the White community of South Africa in every sphere of our society (political, economic, sport, cultural and ecclesiastical) — or the force of violence (with Russian and Cuban support as a realistic possibility) take over. The situation of tension between Black and White has already reached such magnitude and seriousness that I am convinced Holland as well as other countries of the world community which desire to see that fundamental change is effected without violence, should now come to the aid of South Africa to achieve this goal by exercising full scale meaningful pressures to relinquish its present racial policies. I am deeply convinced that this is the last alternative for all those who desire liberation, justice and peace without violence.

I am deeply conscious of the fact that such forms of pressure will evoke a reaction of bitter opposition, yes even of anger from a large part of White South Africa and that anybody from within South Africa who suggests such action, would be exposed to vehement criticism. But I would seriously fail in my duty towards my country with all its inhabitants, Black and White — including my own nation — if at this critical moment of our existence I should remain silent any longer. I know that my proposals emanate from a deep concern that a final attempt should be made to prevent that the devastating fires of violence should over-take our South African society. Resolutions without concrete acts following thereupon no longer have any meaning or value. May God give to you in the Netherlands the wisdom to be willing in this manner to join in our struggle for the establishment of a liberated society based on true humanity, justice and peace.

PATRIOTISM AND NATIONALISM

I was surprised to see that in your March editorial you make the same error as the Nationalist Party does - you equate patriotism with nationalism. Surely these are distinct ideas, the first associated with a particular country, the second with a group of people? Nationalism certainly has been a divisive force in this country, and when my husband and I became subscribers to your journal, some years ago, we did so because we hoped PRO VERITATE would be an instrument of reconciliation for the various nationalisms in South Africa, so that all people here might reach a wider, more profound concept of citizenship in a state enlightened and purified by Christian love.

Now, however, it seems that you have chosen, in abjuring nationalism, to abjure patriotism also. I was interested to observe that in the texts quoted at the close of your editorial, you did not include Matthew 22.21 or Romans 13. Do you really feel that Christ's instruction to "render unto Caesar" should be eliminated, or even just ignored?

If I understand your editorial correctly, it is a call to abandon patriotism for the wider citizenship of the City of God. But

I do not see that the two should be exclusive - rather that the earthly bond should be, as it were, an apprenticeship for the heavenly one. And if we abandon our patriotism, how can we make this country a better place for all its inhabitants? Love of country embraces the people too. Your call to abandon it will lead to an amorphous state of feeling, divorced from everyday reality. For you cannot deny that you live in a state, a country, and that it *is* your "ethnic and geographical background". You cannot abandon these facts, but should rather incorporate them in the higher concept of citizenship of the City of God.

Two of our children are at present doing their military service on the borders of this country. When I measure their idealism against your editorial, it seems to me that you have chosen the wrong direction. I have felt so for some time. Please, therefore, delete our names from your list of subscribers.

— Mrs F. Forbes

AN ANSWER

I would reply by saying:

1. Our concern in PRO VERITATE is to proclaim the truth as we find it in Christ, and to use our pages as a forum for discussion of such themes.

2. The problem of the relationship of a Christian believer to the secular state is an old one to which many solutions have been given in different times. You seem to adopt the standpoint that whilst an aggressive nationalism is wrong, it is a Christian duty to be patriotic.

3. Yet it is (uncomfortably) true that the New Testament does *not* advocate patriotism: it is simply not a Christian concept. Jesus taught in terms of the Kingdom of God on Earth; he refused to accept any patriotic stand or attitude; he revealed on the Cross that such attitudes mean crucifixion; he made it quite clear that Christianity sees human society as groups of people whose belief and life style transcends the conflicting patriotisms of men; he called men out of their nations into his Kingdom; and thought of his followers, not nations, as the basic units of mankind.

4. Thus, although we may have very warm and encouraging feelings about our country and countrymen, the *Christian* vision is of *all* people, and any refusal to accept this (however sincerely made) is the cause of crucifixion again. Patriotism can have a religious content, but never a Christian one.

5. Your reference to your sons on the border highlights the agonising decisions that commitment to Christ can mean. Some go. Some feel that in the name of Christ they cannot fight to defend a system which oppresses blacks; they feel that the problem is not Communism in someone else's country but the rejection of Christ in our own; that if patriotism in South Africa means joining a white army against the wishes of 80% of their fellow countrymen, then a conflict exists between their Christian convictions and their patriotism, in which they can only acknowledge the supremacy of Christ.

6. The reference to Christ's "Render unto Caesar" speech is concerned with the payment of taxes to secular authorities, and has not the slightest reference to patriotism to either the Roman Empire or the Hebrew nation.

In conclusion, may I say that I know this thinking represents a change in our traditional understanding, and is most uncomfortable. But it is obvious that our inherited attitude to patriotism has proved disastrous and is totally untenable to most Christian believers in our land - who happen to be black. In this, as in so many other matters, black Christians have an invaluable insight to give to those who search for Christian reconciliation amongst all men.

— Editor

CALVINISTS IN POTCHEFSTROOM

nicholas wolterstorff

Nicholas Wolterstorff is professor of philosophy, Calvin College, and an editor of the Reformed Journal.

* * *

In the middle of a large noisy gathering of people on a lovely South African spring afternoon, I was talking with a young professor from the University of Potchefstroom. After a week in South Africa, preceded by a few months of reading about it, I was engaged in a practice customary among visitors there pointing out some of the serious injustices in South Africa's legal structure, particularly as it bears on race. How, I wondered, could the Calvinist churches so wholeheartedly approve such structures?

After several minutes of conversation my South African friend said to me: "Look, we South Africans seldom think of social policy in terms of justice. We think in terms of *order*. We point to the present disorders in Angola- and to the disorders in the US over the past decade, and feel our policies justified. The great contribution that you Christians in North America and Europe can make to us in South Africa is to remind us constantly of the call of justice."

Very much indeed of what occurs in South Africa can be explained in terms of a passion for order and a desperate fear of disorder — coupled with a disregard for the fact that though a society cannot be just unless it is orderly, an orderly society may be either just or unjust.

The occasion of my being in South Africa (as those who remember my essay in the "As We See It" section of the September *Journal* will surmise) was my attendance at an international conference of Reformed Christian institutions for higher education, held at Potchefstroom University for Christian Higher Education September 9 - 13. The topic of the conference was "Reformed Institutions for Higher Education as a Bulwark for the Kingdom of God Present and Future." Though it was not the topic of the conference itself, South African racial policy was a topic of constant conversation outside the conference. It influenced the arrangements for the conference in many ways, and at one point emerged within the conference itself.

There was a deep appropriateness to the concern of a gathering of Calvinist scholars for such a fundamental social policy. The appropriateness was pointedly brought home to me by a passage from the conference speech of Reinhold Makrosch (from the Institute for Late Middle Ages and Reformation, In Tübingen, Germany). Discussing "The Conflict between the Lutheran and Calvinist Churches about the Relevance of Faith for Public Life, and the Consequences of this Conflict for Calvinism Research," he said this:

This public relevance of Calvinistic theology became, for the 3rd, 4th and subsequent generations (of the Reformation) a common heritage, which held the most disparate reformed trends together under the vague common concept of "Calvinism". No matter how different the doctrines, liturgies, ethical concepts, and the traditions of the Huguenots, Congregationalists, Puritans, Presbyterians or the Waldensians were — they all felt themselves committed to the heritage of Calvin: not only a reform of doctrine, but also of life; not only a reform of the church

but also of the community. This claim exposed them, as the permanently suppressed minority, to cruel persecution — while the Lutheran churches had long since compromised with the authorities on the basis of "sovereign church government"; they had agreed to a fine distinction between an internal church government by the ministers on the one hand which concerned only the spiritual life, and an external church authority by the provincial governor on the other hand, which concerned external public life. They had thus surrendered all means of direct influence on the organization of public life ... To the Orthodox Lutheranism of the 17th and 18th centuries, it was inconceivable why the Calvinists allowed themselves to be persecuted more frequently on account of political and social reasons than dogmatic principles.

It would be a mistake to suggest that wandering debates about apartheid constituted the main significance of the conference. Rather, the main significance lay in the fact that the international character of the community of Calvinist scholars here came to expression, and that the members of that community interacted with each other. For us in the US it is easy to forget (or never discover) that there is such an international community. Or, if we do have it in mind, we tend to think of it as localized in just three or four centres: Scotland, The Netherlands, North America, and South Africa. At this conference nineteen countries were represented: and in that it was true to the spirit of John Calvin, the most ecumenical of all the classical reformers. Yet the conference also made evident how isolated from each other are the various national components of the community of Calvinist scholars, and how we thereby fail to benefit from and assist in the work of each other.

More specifically, the presence of *Third World* scholars at the conference was an important dimension. Calvinist scholarship is no longer the property of white Westerners. Here were native citizens from Malawi, Zambia, Kenya, Nigeria, Korea, Japan. However, once the initial surprise and delight of seeing and meeting them had subsided into acceptance of the familiar, the question came to mind: Was this conference at all relevant to *their* situations? The conference program had been arranged by South Africans at Potchefstroom — white Westerners. Did it bear on the problems of the third world scholars?

I asked many of them this very question. A few, especially the Orientals, said Yes, the issues posed in the papers were issues they too cared about. More said that the conference was relevant in that it displayed a standard of scholarship which they in their own institutions wanted someday to attain. But many said No, the conference sessions were not very relevant to their situation. They profited from the informal conversations outside the conference, and felt supported thereby in their work. But the issues posed and discussed in the papers were not for the most part issues that concerned them. They were issues that they lacked the luxury and the leisure to consider. What topics would be relevant to their situation? Several answered "church and state." Gradually, I came to understand that this concern was not for intellectual illumination but an existential anguish of great depth. (I shall return to this later.)

No doubt the paper which came closest to treating their

concerns, or at least to speaking on their behalf, was that by Sidney Rooy (Facultad Evangelica de Teologia, Buenos Aires) entitled "The Challenge to Reformed Higher Education in the Latin Third World Countries." It is a psychological, theological, and sociological impossibility, Rooy said.

to say that *one* theology and *our* message is to be preached to the nations. This is possible only on a terribly superficial level in which common terms may be used but which inevitably take on different meanings in changing times and places.

It must be emphasized that the constant and essential factors in the Christian message are not relativized through their historical incarnation. Rather these factors are determining and active agents; they are not themselves being formed.

Nonetheless, it must be maintained that the manifoldness of God's dealing with man, the reality of his active intervention and participation in history, and the ever-new constellation of human possibilities constantly give new meanings and understandings to the Christian community. This must be recognized in order to understand on the one hand the tragedy that has been caused by the exportation of static occidental theologies to the missionary situation, and on the other hand the urgent need for profound reflection and the birth of creative theological formulations in the new world situation which relentlessly imposes itself upon us... Black theology, Asian theology, or Latin American theology should be encouraged and expected.

Rooy then went on to discuss the contributions that Latin American theologians might make to world-wide Christianity. His contentions stirred up a good deal of discussion. But so far as I could discover it was invariably the Westerners who disagreed.

Is the traditional university structure satisfactory?

The opening lecture of the conference was given by Dr H.J.J. Bingle, rector of the host University of Potchefstroom, under the title "A Radical New Order?" The question he asked was whether the traditional structure of the university ought to be altered. His emphatic answer was No. "We accept the established constitution of the university with all its fundamental characteristics." He argued that the traditional structure was in fact being altered around the world under pressures from student radicals. So he urged us all to work to preserve the traditional character of the university wherever it was still present, to restore it wherever it had been lost, and then to teach as Christians within that traditional structure.

That which during the passing of the centuries was crystallized about the form and content of the university, and which has been the result of the work of the faithful and unfaithful at this level, offers all that is necessary to bring the Christian university to full deployment.

I believe this conference has to lead toward the consolidation of Christian institutions for higher education, their propagation, and the concomitant rejection of the neutral university in its present form or in whatever form it may present itself. And for this no new order of the university is required.

These theses evoked vigorous disagreement. Several of us pressed the point that the traditional university was a human creation emerging in nineteenth-century Germany within the milieu of Enlightenment and Romantic thought. Accordingly it was unsatisfactory just to assume, as Bingle did, that the

traditional structure of the university was satisfactory to the Christian scholar and that his only concern should be with the content of the teaching conducted within that structure. For example, at least some defense, starting from Christian conviction, should be given for the totally subservient role of the student in the structure of the traditional university.

One of the South African delegates illuminated for me the pattern of thought at work in Bingle's talk. South African Calvinists, he told me, pervasively think in terms of creational structures and orders. But they blur the distinction between what is normative and what is actual, and thus are often found defending traditional human institutions as being God-ordained. If that analysis is correct, one sees at work in South African Calvinism that very thing which has led so many German theologians since World War II (and uncounted lay Christians) into hostility toward all talk about creational structures. Such talk, they say, functions as a defence of conservatism.

A responsibly critical scholarly community is a service to society

Some of the issues posed by Bingle's speech were picked up in the speech of Henk Hart (ICS, Toronto). Hart first argued that "the shape that might make Christian scholarship especially meaningful in our times ... would be the shape of service." He then went on to say that the *critical* function of scholarship is one facet of its service to society:

It is unfortunate that in our day not the church but Marxism gave the vital impetus to the exercise of the critical function of scholarship... When the community of scholars is aware of its task, it will understand that part of its service is that of critiquing the present.. For that reason it is not only dangerous for the academy to be controlled by ecclesiastical, industrial, or political powers, but it is even risky for the community of scholars not to be able to criticize these institutions or to be afraid of embarrassing them... A critical community of students and teachers which exercises its critical function responsibly is not a danger but a service to society.

"Scholarship," he added, "that truly opens our horizons is ... an important resource for the battle against conservatism in our world.. In most cases the best method for preventing liberalism of all kinds is to attack the conservatism that usually causes it."

Probably the session which most deeply interested the Westerners at the conference, but which at the same time most baffled the third world delegates, was the one in which I gave the opening paper on the relation between religious commitment and theorizing — to which H.G. Stoker (from the philosophy faculty at Potchefstroom) and his colleague J. Christi Coetzee gave responses. For the Enterprise of a Christian college, seminary, and university this is, of course, an absolutely fundamental issue. Yet the philosophical character of the discussion was as baffling to some as it was stimulating to others.

There were a number of significant speeches in addition to those I have cited. I am thinking particularly of Hendrik van Riessen's (Free University, Amsterdam) on "The University As It Is and As It Ought to Be," of John Kromminga's (Calvin Seminary) on "The Threats to the Christian Character of the Christian Institution," of Johan A. Heyns, (Faculty of Theology, Pretoria) on "The Christian Scholar and His Educational Task," and of Heiko Oberman's (Institute of Late Medieval and Reformation, Tübingen) on trends in Calvin

research. Also, at the end of the conference there were several "practical" speeches discussing the status and relationships of Reformed Christian educational institutions on the various continents. But the ones I discussed above are those which evoked the most animated discussion, plus those by S.C.W. Duvenage (Potchefstroom) and Dr Paul Schrottenboer (Reformed Ecumenical Synod) on authority and discipline in the educational institution, and the speech by F.J.M. Potgieter (Faculty of Theology, Stellenbosch).

Apartheid: a legitimate temporary rule of order?

Mention of this last speech brings me back to that inescapable and circumambient issue of apartheid. For it was in Potgieter's speech that the issues of apartheid finally surfaced in the conference itself. It has threatened to surface once before. Those who read my "As We See It" in the September *Journal* will remember that because of an aggravated disagreement over apartheid, Potchefstroom had withdrawn its invitation to the Free University of Amsterdam to attend the conference. One source of friction (among others) had been the insistence by various Dutch representatives that apartheid itself should be discussed at the conference.

On the evening of the opening day of the conference Dr Willem de Klerk, editor of the *Transvaler*, a large Afrikaner newspaper, was scheduled to address the conference. The address never took place. When the text of de Klerk's speech was received prior to the conference it was discovered that, in one of his examples, he had undertaken to defend apartheid and to attack, by name, Dr Beyers Naudé and the Christian Institute. Thereupon certain people insisted to the organizers of the conference that since the Dutch had not been allowed to use the conference to express their opposition to apartheid, de Klerk should not be allowed to use it to express his support. Eventually, de Klerk was asked to delete the offending passages. He replied that he would not submit himself to censorship. So the invitation to him was withdrawn.

Then on Friday evening, in Potgieter's speech, the following passage occurred:

A matter of primary importance in a multi-racial society is that of appointment at and admission to a university. When Roger Apery holds "that there is no such thing as ... French as opposed to German science" it amounts to an over-simplification of the case. Reference has already been made to the diversity and multiformity within creation. Not only individuals, but also nations, reveal difference of endowment and aptitude: the French excel in diplomacy; the Germans distinguish themselves in theoretical insight, and they possess the genius of invention and music; the Romans are the creators of jurisprudence. And precisely by virtue of this multiformity the image of God, in which men individually and mankind as a whole are created, finds greater and more admirable expression.

In addition, it has been shown that a university has the closest relationship with the society from which it derives. It cannot be denied that in the Republic of South Africa universities that bear the stamp of the English, on the one hand, and that of the Afrikaans section of the community, on the other hand, have developed accordingly. If this applies to ethnic groups it will *a fortiori* have relevance to racial groups, where the differences are more pronounced. I could, however, not accept exclusion as a matter of principle, as all men are of the same status before God, but would regard it as a legitimate temporary rule of order, until all racial groups have advanced to that

stage of spiritual maturity, which holds identity in high esteem and results in spontaneous separate development.

To clarify that last sentence: non-whites are not allowed to attend the white universities in South Africa (Potchefstroom has a few blacks who are enrolled, but not permitted to be students on campus), and conversely, whites are not allowed to attend the non-white universities.

This brought the issue of apartheid directly to the floor of the conference. Ironically it was brought there by one of the South Africans -- perhaps a testimony to the inescapable social relevance of scholarly discussion. Considerable discussion of the issue took place before the adjournment time of 10:00 p.m. But it was obvious that much more remained to be said. So it was agreed that those who wished could remain after adjournment for a non-official discussion of apartheid. That session, lasting until well after midnight, was one of the most intense exchanges I have ever attended. The Afrikaners spoke with deep feeling of their cultural oppression at the hands of the English. For generations their forebears had not been allowed to use their mother tongue in the schools, in government positions, and so forth. One of them described the tears of joy which flowed down his father's face when on the stamps of the country there finally appeared late in this century the words "Republiek van Suid-Afrika" alongside "Republic of South Africa." And what they wanted for the Bantus, they said, was what they had wanted for themselves: the chance to be themselves, to use their mother tongue, to develop their own culture.

Yet, moving and illuminating as that was, our questions would not down. Why, we asked, the *must* behind it all? It was admirable to allow and encourage the development of distinct cultures. But why force it by law? Why require that a child reared in Bantu culture remain a member of that culture? Why forbid his entry into Afrikaner culture? What is the justification for the *must*?

To that question we never received an answer. Nor, I discovered afterwards, did the South Africans *think* we had received an answer. I think the painful truth is that they do not have an answer, or at least do not agree on the answer. They fear what would happen if the status quo were changed. So they cling to it. But agreed justification they do not have.

And then other questions surfaced. The "Coloureds" who live in the Cape area -- mixed descendants of the original Dutch and the native Hottentots -- are also not permitted to attend Potchefstroom nor any other white university. Moreover, their franchise was withdrawn from them in the 1930's. Yet their mother tongue and culture have for centuries been Afrikaans. What then can explain their treatment? Do we not here spot an unmistakably racist basis for Afrikaner policy -- just as Potgieter himself suggested in his speech?

Then too, can the treatment of the blacks outside their homelands, in the white part of South Africa, really be explained in terms of the wish to encourage their distinctive development? Does its explanation not rather lie in the wish of the whites to develop their own culture? And have they not exploitingly enlisted the blacks in their pursuit of this goal? The whites speak of the highly technological culture which *they* have built in South Africa -- suggesting thereby that it also belongs to them to dispose of as they wish. But the fact is that the Western culture of South Africa has been built by the whites and blacks together. It has been erected on the backs of cheap black labor, with the whites controlling the distribution of the benefits, and keeping the lion's share of them for themselves.

On the Thursday of the conference week we were all taken to visit a gold mine. I came away convinced that the enterprise is a massive monument to human folly — to our stupid human lust for that soft yellow metal. The gold-bearing rock is now hauled up from 3 300 meters underground, run through enormous crushers until it is thoroughly pulverized, and then subjected to various chemical processes until finally the bars of pure metal emerge only to find their way, most of them, once again underground in such places as Fort Knox. What we discovered on our visit is that such a mine would not be economically feasible in any other Western country. It is feasible in South Africa because of cheap black labour. And yet — this is the complicating irony — blacks from Mozambique are eager to work in the South African mines. For hard as the work may be and meagre the pay, yet the work and the pay are better than are available in their own country. We also discovered that some of the lower level supervisory positions are occupied by both whites and blacks — with the whites, however, being paid ten times more than the blacks simply because the labour of the blacks can be bought that much more cheaply.

Eventually, however, I came to believe that the treatment of the blacks and the Coloureds in South African society is but one phase of the evils which follow when a society's passion for order muffles the call for justice. For in many ways the position of the young white professors at Potchefstroom is as bad as the position of the blacks in the society generally. Order in South African society is profoundly hierarchical, from top down, with old people having enormous power and with great attention to ceremony and ritual. The structure is like that of Dutch and German society up to, say, 75 years ago. Those near the bottom of the hierarchy are regarded, in paternalistic fashion, as children who must be shaped and formed and developed until some of them are one day capable of fitting into the top slots. The Bantus are explicitly spoken of as children (with the father being understood as one of those old-fashioned parents who rarely thinks in terms of the *rights* of the child but only in terms of the need to mold and form the child). But equally the young professor in the university is treated as a child. He, too, has no voice. He, too, is told what to do. In this institution, too, order is the guiding image. In all my days I shall never forget a four-hour-long outpouring of anguished powerlessness by one of those young professors.

And so, to the Afrikaners in South Africa, I say what that other young professor who is among you told us here to say: *Listen to the call for justice*. In your passion for order you are postponing — until who knows when, but surely until too late — the demands for just treatment. Your priorities are wrong. A just society must be an orderly society. But when order is given top spot, injustice and its life-destroying consequences flow forth.

And you, humiliated as you were at the hands of the English — do you not see that you are doing to the blacks the very thing that the English did to you? You let them speak their mother tongue, indeed. Yet you humiliate them. You make them ashamed of their God-given blackness, no longer proud of their particular humanity. You have made them think of you, the whites, as inherently superior. *Baas*, they call you. Boss.

I do not say these things out of some lofty judgmental position. I know very well that we in the US have no serious "Indian problem" because while spinning long ropes of broken treaties we killed off our native Americans. I know very well that you do better by your homelands than we have ever done by our Indian reservations. I know very well that for the very same work we have paid and do still pay women less than men.

I know very well that the racial proportions here are almost the reverse of yours — here 11% non-whites. there 80%. I know very well that we are suffering the evil results of mechanical and belligerent efforts to achieve integration. I know very well that we in the South have systematically spent less per head on the education of black children than on that of white. So I speak to you with stained hands.

Yet I say: In your passion for order you are not listening to the call for justice. In your fear of chaos you are humiliating the blacks. And along the way you have brought the church of God into captivity. No longer does she stand apart from the social order — speaking the Word of judgment and of promise and of new beginnings. She is submerged within that order, her speech on behalf of her suffering Lord all but inaudible.

You are dearly tempted to reply that I do not understand the complexities of the situation. Indeed I don't. But I am only saying back to you what your restless ones have said to me but don't themselves dare to say out loud. Listen to yourselves, to your pained and searching ones, is my plea.

I cannot close without relating an incident whose memory still evokes emotions of enraged agony. While in South Africa I discovered the existence of its anti-terrorism laws. These allow the police to detain a person for 90 days without filing a public charge, without notifying anyone where the person is held, without giving him access to attorney, and with the right repeatedly to renew the 90 days period if they so wish. I find such a law outrageous. I can scarcely understand why the Christians in South Africa do not rise up in protest. And when I remember that it is Christians who are responsible for the law I am left uncomprehending. Why must the passion for order be carried to such extremity? If someone is indeed a danger to the legitimate interests of the state, let a public charge be filed and let the courts judge the matter. If I can believe what a deeply committed young Christian student told me, the law is used as much against those who speak and act out of Christian conviction, but in disagreement with the policy of the government, as against others.

For me it was a matter of conscience to have an interview with Rev. C.F. Beyers Naudé while in South Africa. So it was arranged that on the evening of September 17 Gerald Vande Zande (Committee for Justice and Liberty, Toronto) and I would have an interview with Naudé in our hotel in Pretoria. The interview was never held. Two days before, one of Naudé's principal assistants had been arrested under the anti-terrorism detention law; and Naudé was then so preoccupied with reorganizing his staff and trying to find out where his assistant was being held that he had to break the appointment. (Subsequently Vande Zande did hold the interview.)

Profoundly disturbed over the existence of a society in which such an event could take place, and in which those responsible for its taking place were members of the Calvinist churches, I walked the streets of Pretoria that night with a man from Malawi, spilling out my rage and agony. After some thirty minutes of this I suddenly noticed that my companion was absorbing all this with little noticeable reaction, I asked him how it could be that if I was so enraged, he could be so calm. His answer I shall never forget: "I live with this sort of thing every day of my life," he said. "If ever I would criticize my government outside a tiny circle of trusted friends I would be arrested, my family would lose its form of livelihood, and my seminary would be closed." Then suddenly I saw what he had meant when he said earlier in the week that the problem which concerned him was the problem of church and state. Then suddenly I saw what a privilege it is to live in my own country.

where I can vigorously criticize the government in public without ever fearing reprisal. Then suddenly I saw how naive it is for us in the Western world to say to those people: "But why are you so silent? Why aren't you up and protesting?" And then suddenly I saw why St. Paul told the slave to go back to his master.

But South Africa is a Western country. And her leaders are Christians — Calvinist Christians.

The Republic of South Africa is a beautiful country. Her people are enormously vigorous, and unforgettably generous. And they are patient beyond belief. Each time again they listen to us foreigners on the same old topic. How they must long to get on to something else. And yet they know they cannot, until that day when their agony is lifted. For agonized they are — all of them. The blacks are oppressed by the laws and the economy of the whites. The young whites are oppressed by their elders. And the powerful elders are the most oppressed of all, oppressed by fear — the fear of what would happen if ...

The University of Potchefstroom no doubt wanted its international conference of Calvinist scholars to shine in splendour undimmed by the clouds of the surrounding social realities. That was not to be. No doubt they never really believed it would be. The conference was a good beginning. Three years from now a successor will be held at Calvin College on the topics of "The Responsibility of Christian Higher Education to the Problems of Modern Society." The University of Potchefstroom is to be thanked heartily for what

it has begun. And I do believe that some day it will be able to take pride in the fact that in this first conference already there was, in spite of efforts to prevent it, an intertwining of Christian scholarship and social realities. For insofar as that was true, the conference was faithful to the tradition from which it sprang, the tradition begun by the Reformer of Geneva, who longed for the abstracted and unhurried life of the scholar but was instead dragged back into the city by the insistent Farel.

* * * * *

This article was originally published in The Reformed Journal (Grand Rapids Michigan, U.S.A.) November 1975 by Professor Nicholas Wolsterhoff, one of the editors of this Journal, who attended a conference of Reformed Christian institutions for higher education in Potchefstroom, September 9 - 13, 1975. We reprint this article (with acknowledgement to The Reformed Journal) in the belief that Christians in South Africa, especially those of the Reformed tradition, should seriously consider the opinions and concerns expressed in this article.

— Editor.

DOOR

I open the door and see no one
I always open the door
I think I will wait
someone may come some day
someone who wants to see me
someone who will listen to me
one must have patience
one must trust
one must have faith
I want someone to see me
I want someone to hear me talk
I want someone to knock on the door

— Wopko Jensma

"Sing for our Execution"
Ravan Press

AWARENESS

Gone are the sweet days of my ignorance,
the lullaby of unknowing
soft as the dove-song in Cape trees
telling of peace, peace ...
Gone is the peace of my innocence,
my joy in the land,
wrapped like a cloak about me
gentle as spring.

Now I see hell's images
in the dust red sky.
Now my cloak is rough and hurting,
drawing blood.
Now I hear a different song,
a bitter one;
and the shadows of millions of faces
darken my vision.

—Joan Kirchoff

WESTERN COLOURED TOWNSHIP

by Marianne Brindley (Ravan Press, R4,20)

This study of an urban slum is a portrait of human misery and the grinding poverty in which people live in Western. In the words of the author "it is an area which has gradually disintegrated into an amorphous group of people characterised by neglect, gangwarfare, marital violence, alcoholism, illegitimacy and a lack of community feeling". Some of the statistical data is more than disturbing - in the old area of Western which houses four-fifths of the estimated total population of 12 000, the average monthly salary is R78,24 (1974); the Pretoria Bureau of Statistics (1974) gave the life expectancy of Coloured males as 48,8; the mean age in the old area is 23,7 -- a very young population to have grown up with totally inadequate provision for education; accommodation is primitive and overcrowded. The original dwellings in the area (2 000 in number) were regarded as "temporary" when the Blacks were moved out of the area in the 1950s, yet 1 500 of these still stand -- with no lighting, no indoor hot or cold water and no baths. In the new area of Western low wages and high rentals are a source of friction. The average wage (1974) is R146,20 a month. Rental is one third of the real income and electricity charges are high.

Apart from the material hardships, the author states that she considers the lack of identity of the Coloured person to be the "key issue around which revolves his personal despair". She points out that the attitude to Coloureds is one of negativism. In terms of the law a Coloured is someone who cannot be classified as anything else. They are "marginal" people. In addition to the classification "Coloured" there is a category "Other Coloured". One man in Western said: "All right they've taken my home from me, I can't live where I want to, and now they want to rob me of the only other possession I have -- my children, and they tell me they are not my blood! ... Can you explain it to me? I am a Cape Coloured: look here is proof, my identity card. My wife is a Cape Coloured, there see, there it's written; but our children are classified as "Other Coloured" -- here in red writing on their identity cards --- Ander Gekleurde. Now what's this other Coloured business? Why are my children not classified like me and my wife, they're our blood ..."

The author has suggested various means by which conditions could be ameliorated in the short term and makes an appeal for long-term changes in policy. After reading the study one is left with the feeling that without a radical change in official policy, any other efforts would be like trying to empty the sea with a teacup. Without such a change the future can hold nothing for these people but the continued knowledge of their defeat.

On the negative side -- footnotes at the end of each chapter are an irritation. It would be easier on the reader if these were placed at the foot of the relevant page. It might also have been of value to the reader in getting the study into perspective if a chapter covering the political development regarding the Coloured people had been included. The author states that people in Western are too apathetic to discuss politics -- yet reference is made to the fact that the faith of many people in the goodwill and sincerity of the authorities is crumbling. There is expressed dissatisfaction with unequal pay for equal work and with job reservation -- all political factors. The roots of the growing distrust of the authorities go back a long way

perhaps to 1954 when the government enlarged the Senate to 87 in order to get the two-thirds majority required to deprive Coloured men in the Cape and Natal of the franchise (and then reduced the Senate when this aim had been achieved). The Coloured Representative Council is a body with no sovereign powers -- and its recent confrontation with the authorities has been a result of long-growing dissatisfaction and distrust. In terms of the Group Areas Act, more Coloured people have had to move out of their homes than all other groups put together. There is no ethnic group "Coloured" -- without political determinants Coloureds do not exist.

This study should be useful for both students and academics and it is a source of much valuable information to the man-in-the-street who can get a very good idea of what it is like to be a Coloured person living in Western. The study is illustrated with a number of very good black and white photographs and at the price it is well worth buying.

dawn conn

REFLECTIONS AT A BLACK SASH STAND

My heart cries out within me as I watch
Affluent Whites go by
Well clothed, well fed, secure
Within their circle,
Privilege.
How many care, or even think
Of those
Deprived by their very having?
I see one smile,
Superior, aloof,
Scornful of those who stand,
And seeing not their placards,
Caring not for truth
Thus starkly told.
The others walking by--
Non-citizens, Non people,
Called Non-whites--
They understand too well.
Theirs is a daily knowledge,
Part of life,
A constant pain and anguish
Like a knife
Which turns within their hearts.
My heart cries out within me,
But my eyes are dry,
And hollow is my hope.

Helen Kotzé

PRO VERITATE

CHRISTELIKE MAANDBLAD
MEI 1976
JAARGANG 14 NR. 12

CHRISTIAN MONTHLY
MAY 1976
VOLUME 14 NO. 12

SUBSCRIPTION payable in advance. Surface mail, SA and SWA - R3; airmail - R4,20. Cheques and postal orders to be made payable to Pro Veritate (Pty) Ltd., P.O. Box 31135, Braamfontein 2017. Price per single copy - 25c.

OUTSIDE SOUTH AFRICA: Africa and the Far East: Please contact Ms. Muriel D. Bissell, P.O. Box 214, Lusaka, Zambia.

The rest of the world: Please contact Pro Veritate, c/o The Administration Department, G.D.R., P.O. Box 14100, Utrecht, The Netherlands. The Christian Institute, an "affected organisation" by Government decree, cannot receive money from outside South Africa.

PLEASE NOTE: The Editorial Staff of Pro Veritate are not responsible for opinions and standpoints which appear in any article of this monthly magazine other than those in the editorial statements. Printed by Zenith Printers (Pty) Ltd., 80 Jorissen Street, Braamfontein 2001.

PRO VERITATE appears on the 15th of every month.

EDITOR: Cedric Mayson.

APPLICATION FORM FOR MEMBERSHIP OF CHRISTIAN INSTITUTE

Please enrol me as a member of the Christian Institute of Southern Africa.

I enclose the amount of (minimum R1 p.a. per person) as my subscription.

Name:
(Prof Dr. Rev. Mr. Mrs. Miss).

Address:

Postal Address:

Date: Tel No.:

Church:

TO PRO VERITATE, P.O. BOX 31135,
BRAAMFONTEIN, 2017, South Africa.

ORDER FORM

Please arrange for me to receive **Pro Veritate** every month. I enclose the annual subscription of R3,00.

Name:

Postal Address:

INHOUD • CONTENTS

Redaksioneel:

GOD IS 'N „ONS-MOMENT" 1

Editorial:

GOD IS AN "US-MOMENT" 2

ARE SOME WARS JUST?
— James Moulder 4

RESPONSIBLE LIBERATION
— C.F.B. Naudé 5

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR 8

CALVINISTS IN POTCHEFSTROOM
— Nicholas Wolterstorff 9

WESTERN COLOURED TOWNSHIP
— Marianne Brindley 14