

tend to come in the form of shock—bombs and motorcars—one might even say that modern life is lived in an expectance of shock (which is not the same as being guarded against it); the end result is a state of apprehensive numbness. We all know the image of the operating theatre—the peaceful, drugged whiteness in which there lurks a knife. It is another of those images that have become a bore. Saunders doesn't use it. But the image gives the general set-up. The emotion that it expresses is panic—and panic must be about the most useless emotion there is.

Bunuel showed, in *The Discrete Charm of the Bourgeoisie*, that a technique analogous to Saunders's could be used to define the consciousness of the bourgeois class: leading hot-house lives, but with the sense of terrible lives being

lived elsewhere, and lived for them, on their behalf, so that at any moment the terror might break into their own lives—hence numbness and apprehension. And all four poets show an awareness of this flabbily-lived tension in South African suburbia. Walter Saunders gives it some sharpness. He is an accurate instrument all right—I just don't see that his method does anyone any good. In fact, I don't think these 'serious' poems are serious at all—they, too, are games: the slightly hysterical games of an effete class.

Whereas when Saunders plays games for fun, he plays them for real: and I wouldn't say either that they are lacking in profundity, but never mind that . . .

CARNIVAL!

# THE GRAMMAR OF INTIMIDATION

A glance at Church-State Relationships

by EDGAR BROOKES

South Africa, which somewhat ostentatiously claims to be a Christian country, and which certainly welcomes white immigration, places very effective restrictions on the immigration of white ministers of religion. The practice is to give such ministers a temporary residence permit, which requires to be renewed after a relatively short period. The simple refusal to do this has the effect of deportation. The minister has to go. There is no one to whom he may appeal. No more effective method could have been devised for intimidating young clergy, and even for encouraging their Church authorities to warn them to be quiet and inoffensive, for fear of losing them.

No one can say how many able men have been restrained from expressing their views by this ingenious method, but it is possible to gather certain statistics about the non-renewal of permits. Over the years 1965–1972 conservative figures, excluding formal deportations, show that thirty-two ministers of religion failed to secure renewal of their temporary residence permits. Of these twelve were Anglicans, seven Roman Catholics, six Lutherans, four Methodists and three Congregationalists. Needless to say the Dutch Reformed Churches, which do not import their ministers from overseas, are not hit by this particular device. The country of origin of these ministers is usually Britain, but quite a few come from Germany and from the United States of America.

The Anglican Church has suffered particularly severely. Five Bishops (Reeves of Johannesburg, Crowther of Kimberley and Kuruman, Mize, Winter and Wood of Damaraland) have either been deported or had their entrance permits withdrawn. If Bill Burnett had been born



Daryl Nero

at Stow-in-the Wold instead of (happily) at Koffiefontein, he would have been in similar danger.

Talking of Mize, Winter and Wood, the case of the diocese of Damaraland, which is equivalent to South-West Africa or Namibia, calls for special attention, for there it is possible to place restrictions **within** the area. Most of the Anglicans of this Territory are in Ovamboland, but the Administration has successfully kept most of the Anglican clergy out of that area. Not only the Bishop but the Dean (who is a qualified medical doctor) and would-be teachers and office staff have been effectively debarred from entry. This is all the more remarkable in view of Article 5 of the Mandate for South-West Africa which reads:

Subject to the provisions of any local law for the maintenance of public order and public morals, the Mandatory shall ensure in the territory freedom of conscience and the free exercise of all forms of worship, and shall allow all missionaries, nationals of any State member of the League of Nations, to enter, travel and reside in the territory, for the purpose of prosecuting their calling.

Since the Mandate is the only possible argument in International Law for validating South Africa's control of South-West Africa, it is remarkable that it should have been so flagrantly violated. It is not even pretended that the ministers of the Anglican Church in South-West Africa have been engaged in subversive activities. The case of Bishop Mize (who incidentally is an American) was a nine days' wonder to his colleagues. If South-West Africa were ever to become Namibia, it would spell freedom not only to the inhabitants but to the Christian Churches.

Within the Republic, Bishop Sundkler of the Church of Sweden, a former missionary in our country and a recognised authority on the Bantu Separatist Churches, was refused permission to enter the KwaZulu homeland, in which Swedish missionaries have been working for nearly a century. It comes as no surprise after this that Martin Luther King was in 1966 refused permission to enter South Africa.

The effect of all this is to silence missionaries and ministers, to enable the Government to maintain a vendetta (as in the case of South-West Africa) against Churches which it dislikes and, with no effort, to discriminate in favour of the Dutch Reformed as against all other missionaries and ministers.

But let a minister of the N.G. Kerk kick over the traces and he will also suffer serious disabilities. Take the case of Rev. Beyers Naudé and his colleagues in the Christian Institute. There is a record of withdrawal of passports (some of which have admittedly been returned), bannings and other restrictions, which means that the Christian Institute has all the time to swim against the current, and to pursue its difficult work in the face of Government-imposed difficulties.

The recent action of the Government in applying the Affected Organisations Act to the Christian Institute and thereby depriving it of all its overseas funds is the culmination of a series of provocative actions. It is the result of the report of a non-judicial commission which has heard only evidence against the Christian Institute and has decided rather as a political than a judicial body. The decision of the Government is intended to cripple the activities of the Christian Institute and will probably do so, although the loyalty and self-denial of its South African membership will prevent the crippling from being as effective as the Government hopes. It is another and a most glaring instance of Governmental action against the Christian Churches.

There is the matter of searching homes. The writer knows of two Anglican Bishops whose homes have been searched and of a Bishop's Chaplain whose home was raided at about 3 o'clock in the morning while his wife was caring for a fortnight-old baby.

It is time that a full enquiry was made into this interference with the Churches, and with the general administration of Passports which has become quite political. It cannot be mere coincidence that African, Coloured and Indian applicants for passports to enable them to attend religious conferences have often received permission (if indeed they receive it at all) on the very day before they were due to sail or fly and no earlier. This vexatious practice must be approved by someone in the Department of the Interior; but by whom? The completely bureaucratic system of issuing passports makes it necessary to ask such a question.

For practising Christians these matters are naturally very important. But even to agnostics who never enter a church they are serious, for they represent an attack on civil liberty and on freedom of speech at a particularly vulnerable point. The Churches, with all their faults, have been led by valiant fighters against apartheid, and have had a steady influence on public opinion in this field. Must they be persecuted by anonymous officials without South Africans raising a voice of protest?□