



By die poskantoor as  
nuusblad ingeskryf

**+**

oktober  
1974

# PRO VERITATE

# PRO VERITATE

CHRISTELIKE MAANDBLAD  
REDAKTEUR: ROELF MEYER V.D.M.

OKTOBER 1974  
JAARGANG 13 NR. 6

## INHOUD

<b>Redaksioneel:</b>	
DIE EINDE VAN DIALOOG?	1
<b>Editorial:</b>	
THE END OF DIALOGUE?	2
SELF-HELP AND THE CHURCH	3
THE LIBERATION ISSUE	6
<b>Die kern van die saak:</b>	
NIE MEER „ONS MENSE" NIE	7
<b>The root of the matter</b>	
DOUBLE STANDARDS	8
FEAR IS PART OF THE GAME	9
THE STATE VS. THE CHURCH	10
IS THE CHURCH IRRELEVANT?	11
A MAN FORCED INTO A VACUUM	12
DIE KERK I.P.V. DIE STAAT MOET LEI	15
HAMMANSKRAAL IS NIE STAATSONDERMYNEND NIE	15
GEWEEG EN...?/WEIGHED AND...?	16
TOTALITARIANISM	21
NO CARD, NO JOB	25

### VOOR- EN AGTERBLAD

Verbysterende swart-  
man en ontwykende  
vrede—N. Mgesi.

### FRONT AND BACK COVERS

"Stunned black man  
and elusive peace"  
—N. Mgesi.

**SUBSCRIPTION** payable in advance. Surface mail S.A. and S.W.A. R3, airmail R4 20. Surface mail African States and Rhodesia R3 50, airmail R6. Seamail United Kingdom and Europe R3 50, airmail R6. Seamail America R3 50, airmail R7. Cheques and postal orders to be made payable to Pro Veritate (Pty) Ltd, P.O. Box 31135, Braamfontein, Transvaal. Price per single copy 25c.

**NEDERLAND:** Zeepost f 14 50. Luchtpost-editie f 24 50. Alle Betalingen voor Pro Veritate of het Christelijk Instituut voor Z.A. kunnen geschieden op Giro 8685 t.n.v. de Generale Diaconale Raad der Ned. Herv. Kerk te Utrecht—met opgave doel der betaling.

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

**PRO VERITATE** appears on the 15th of every month.

# DIE EINDE VAN DIALOOG?

'n Fopspeen kan 'n baba moontlik 'n ruk lank flous dat hy daarmee tevrede sal wees, maar as die baba 'n gesonde eetlus het, sal hy na 'n ruk lank aanhou om van hom te laat hoor totdat hy sy kos kry. Die regering het ook probeer om die Kleurlinge 'n ruk lank te paai met allerhande skynregte en -voorregte, maar geen egte mens sal tot ruste kom voordat hy sy basiese Godgegewe regte geniet het.

Baie jare gelede toe die „afsonderlike ontwikkelingsbeleid” die Kleurling die basiese reg ontnem het om enige sinvolle seggenskap oor homself in sy geboorteland te geniet, kon hy met talle beloftes en vooruitsigte gekalmeer word. Die stadium het egter nou aangebreek dat daardie passiewe aanvaarding van die status quo waar die Kleurlinge met die veronregting tevrede moet wees, vir goed verby is. Die Kleurling het deur die hele skynoplossing van die sogenaamde paralelle ontwikkeling gesien en kan nooit weer met enige nagmaakte oplossing tevrede gestel word nie.

Erger nog, die skok wat sy vertrouwe in die witman en sy regering opgedoen het, sal miskien baie lank neem om verwerk te word, indien daar nie onmiddellik radikale verandering kom nie. Die basiese grondslag waarop enige mense-verhouding of politieke stabiliteit gebou kan word, is vertrouwe. Die geloofwaardigheid van die witman het by die bruin- en swartman sy laagtepunt bereik. So pas het 'n belangrike Kleurlingleier te kenne gegee dat hy geen sin meer daarin sien om op die huidige basis verder met die regering „dialoog” te voer nie. Dit kan die begin van 'n finale breuk in mense-verhoudinge in Suid-Afrika beteken. As daar nie meer met mekaar, en tot mekaar gesprek kan word nie, is die einde van die moontlikheid tot enige vreedsame, rasionele oplossing bereik. Dit wil natuurlik sê as 'n mens aanvaar dat daar ooit enige wesenlike verhouding tussen swart en wit in die afgelope dekades in Suid-Afrika was. Was dit nie tog maar 'n geval van absolute dominasie waar die een maar net beveel het omdat hy die mag en rykdom in die hande gehad het, en die ander maar net moes saamspeel, of hy wou of nie, omdat die reëls van die spel sonder meer vir hom uitgespel is nie?

„Dialoog” tussen die Blanke en die Kleurling is

besig om sy masker te verloor en die Kleurling is besig om aan die blanke sy egte menswees, wat jare lank vertrap is, te toon. Dit kan die blanke alleenlik goed doen. Dit kan hom dwing om die werklike situasie vierkantig in die oë te kyk. Hy sal bereid moet wees om sy skuld voor God en mens te bely en vir sy naaste, i.p.v. langs hom of teen hom te lewe.

Indien dit nie gebeur nie, is die einde van die pad van dialoog bereik—en dit is voorwaar erg as twee persone nie met mekaar kontak maak, of wil maak nie.

Dialoog, 'n woord, ja, die Woord tussen God en mens het die basis vir die oplossing van die mens se verskriklike probleme gelê. God het in Christus gespreek en die Woord van Liefde het vlees geword en bevryding, verlossing en lewe gebring.

Hierdie bevryding kon egter eers kom nadat Christus sy heerlijkheid afgelê het, homself verloën het en bereid was om sy lewe as Mens vir die mens aan die kruis af te lê.

In Suid-Afrika sal die witman, wat eintlik die belangrikste deel van die probleem is, alleenlik van sy vrees bevry kan word indien hy bereid is om sy greep op sy mag en rykdom te laat skiet en dit met sy medemens voor God se aangesig te deel.

Die tyd daarvoor het nou aangebreek anders kan die moontlikheid van 'n binnelandse vreedsame oplossing finaal verby wees.

Die witman het nog een kans en dit is om met die Kleurling en die Swartman te spreek—maar dan moet dit 'n egte, waaragtige bevrydende woord wees. Dit moet 'n dialoog van *mens* tot *mens* wees. Dit moet van hart tot hart wees; daar moet lewenskontak gemaak word. Alleenlik dit kan in dié situasie nog sinvol wees en betekenis hê. Sal dit nou, na die ontnugterende ervaring met die Kleurlinge en die weiering van mnr Leon om verder met die regering dialoog te voer, gebeur? Of sal Kleurlinge se wegkeer van die Blanke iets van God's woord deur sy profeet aan Efraim beteken, nl.: „Efraim is gekoppel aan die afgode; laat hom staan!”? Is die Blanke so vasgekoppel aan sy rassuiwerheid, egoïstiese nasionalisme en mags- en wapenvertroue dat dit te laat sal wees voordat hy die dodelike gevaar besef? ★

## EDITORIAL

# THE END OF DIALOGUE ?

You can probably deceive a baby for a time with a dummy so that he is satisfied with it, but if he has a healthy appetite he will after a while let his voice be heard until he gets his food. The government has also tried to appease the Coloured people for a while with all kinds of sham rights and privileges, but no persons of integrity will quiet down before they are allowed to enjoy their basic God-given rights.

Many years ago when the "policy of separate development" deprived the Coloured people of the right of enjoying any meaningful say in their own affairs in the land of their birth, they could still be pacified with promises and prospects held out to them. The stage has now however been reached when this passive acceptance of the status quo in which the Coloureds must be satisfied with injustice, has gone for ever. The Coloured man has seen through the whole mock solution of so-called parallel development, and can never again be palmed off with counterfeit.

Worse still, the shock inflicted on his trust in the white man and the white man's government will perhaps take a long time to wipe out unless immediate and radical change comes about. The basic principle upon which any human relation or political stability is built is that of trust. The trustworthiness of the White man has in the view of the Coloured man and the Black man reached its nadir. Recently an important Coloured leader has made known that he no longer sees any sense in continuing 'dialogue' with the government on the present basis. This could mean the beginning of the final break in human relations in South Africa. If there can be no further talk with and to each other, **then this is the end of the possibility of reaching a peaceful, rational solution**—that is to say, of course, if one accepts that there ever was any real relation between Black and White in previous decades in South Africa. Was it not really just a case of absolute domination where the one simply gave the orders because he had the power and the wealth in his hands and the other had perforce to concur because this was simply how the rules of the game were spelt out to him.

"Dialogue" between White and Coloured is in the process of dropping its mask and the Coloured man is in the process of showing the White man his

true 'humanness' which for years has been trampled upon. This can only be of benefit to the White man. It can compel him to face the actual situation foursquare. He must be prepared to confess his guilt before God and man and to learn to live for his neighbour instead of alongside of him or against him.

If this does not happen then we have reached the end of the road of dialogue and it is indeed a sorry state of affairs when two persons do not make contact with each other or do not wish to do so.

Dialogue, a word, yes, the Word between God and man, laid the basis of the solution for men's appalling problems. God spoke in Christ and the Word of Love was made flesh and brought redemption, deliverance and life.

This redemption could however only come to pass after Christ had laid aside His glory, had denied Himself and was ready to sacrifice His life as Man for men on the Cross.

In South Africa the white man who is in the last instance the most important part of the problem itself, can only be freed from his fear when he is prepared to surrender his grip on his power and wealth and to share these with his fellowman in the sight of God.

The time is ripe *now*—and if we let it slip the possibility of an internal peaceful solution may have eluded us forever.

The white man has still one chance and this is to talk with the Coloured man and the Black man—but in this event it must be a genuine and liberating word that is spoken. It must be a dialogue between *man* and *man*. Heart must speak to heart; a vital contact must be made. This course alone can be meaningful and have significance in this situation. Will it now come to pass after the disillusioning experience with the Coloureds and the refusal of Mr Leon to hold further dialogue with the government? Or will the Coloureds' rejection of the white man carry something of the meaning of God's word as spoken through his prophet to Ephraim, viz.: "Ephraim kept company with idols; let him alone!"? Is the white man so firmly linked to his purity of race, egoistic nationalism and his reliance on power and weapons that it will be too late before he realizes his peril? ★



# self-help and the church

**TEMBA SIBEKO**

*Mr Temba Sibeko is the Field Officer of the Border Council of Churches. His main responsibility is to organize community development programmes in the Border area.*

Less than ten years ago churches in this country worked separately and independently of each other. They often competed with each other. But the wind of change came. Everywhere the situation began to change. There were terrific pressures on the Church. The old order was being challenged; the selfishness of men was unmasked. Man's inhumanity to man was openly and unashamedly revealed; there was suffering.

Among other things that happened in South Africa was the shameful removal of people. They were dumped in places that were out of the view of visitors and of people who, irrespective of race or colour, find it revolting to witness men being subjected to disgusting conditions. In spite of the precautions taken to prohibit people from visiting these places—for example, by keeping the place under surveillance and having only one entrance to it—the conditions under which these people lived came to the attention of the civilized world. The situation assumed alarming proportions when in addition Black people who were regarded by the White authorities as no longer productive were moved to the undeveloped areas—the so-called 'Bantu Homelands'. In this way towns like Dimbaza, Ilinge, Sada and Welcome Woods came into existence.

In spite of the ridiculous attempts to hide these people away, the situation attracted the attention of people who cared. Funds poured in for aid and relief work. The churches learnt to work together. As a result of the way in which the relief fund expanded it became necessary and possible to establish and organize regular aid in certain areas in the King William's Town district and, in particular, at Dimbaza and St. Matthews.

From the experience gained in this aid and relief work there grew an awareness that "charity hand-outs" were not sufficient to lift the needy from their depressed conditions. Christians, therefore, began to express their compassion in new and creative ways. They recognised that it was necessary to go further than charity and to try to help people to help themselves.

The Border Council of Churches has been trying to help the people of the Ciskei in a practical, down-to-earth way. And they have done so by initiating and supporting various self-help projects. After a great deal of preliminary planning it was decided to appoint a Field Officer to initiate and organize this work. Amongst other things, he initiates, co-ordinates and, when necessary, supervises various self-help projects; and he helps Christian congregations to be more aware of their responsibility to help their neighbours in practical ways.

Here is a list of some of the churches which, with the Border Council of Churches, are involved in this work: Methodist, Lutheran, Presbyterian, Roman

Catholic, Anglican and Congregational. These churches liaise closely with the Dutch Reformed Churches who are also pioneering in this field. The churches which are involved with the Border Council of Churches have all pledged themselves to help finance this work. And generous grants have been received from the Anglo American Corporation's Chairman's Fund; the Quaker Service Fund of the Western Cape; and the Diocese of Port Elizabeth.

Like the South African Council of Churches to which it is affiliated, the Border Council of Churches has various divisions: Home and Family Life, Christian Mission and Evangelism; Dependants Conference; and Inter-Church-Aid. The division of Inter-Church-Aid has the most extensive programmes: aid and relief work, self-help projects and schemes for educational aid in the form of bursaries. The Field Officer is directly responsible to this division and I want to concentrate on what it attempts to do. In fact, the other divisions support and consolidate the work and goals of the division of Inter-Church-Aid.

#### **The goals of Inter-Church-Aid**

The Inter-Church-Aid programme required us to be realistic and specific about what we hoped to achieve; to set our goals clearly before us and to plan accordingly. The Border Council of Churches, therefore, set itself several goals, some of which may be summarised as follows:

- (i) To demonstrate the Church's witness through Christian compassion for those who are in dire need;
- (ii) To promote a sense of human dignity and self-reliance in the community;
- (iii) To initiate and promote various self-help development projects;
- (iv) To foster, organize and direct the moral and mental well-being of the community;
- (v) To present the Gospel in its fullness.

For several reasons, but chiefly to encourage community initiative, the Border Council of Churches has developed a regional approach to its work. Each area has its own committee. And a major responsibility of the Field Officer is to co-ordinate the work of all these committees; to keep in contact with them, and to supply information, advice and guidance when these are necessary.

The work done by the KingWilliam's Town Inter-Church-Aid is an example of what is being done. This committee is often referred to as the Mother Committee in the Border area. And over the last few years it has developed and expanded its work tremendously; especially in the area of aid and relief work and in the field of self-help and community development projects.

Dimbaza is one of the communities which this Committee serves. The vast majority of Dimbaza's inhabitants are old people. They have been brought here from different places in South Africa. Most of them have come from cities, small towns and white farms from

across the length and breadth of the Cape Province. They have nothing in common with each other except their plight. In fact, they felt lost when they came. It is not easy for old people to make a new life and new friends. They had been sent away from the places where they had worked for years. And this had happened simply because they were now spent and no longer productive. They have no reserves from which they can provide for themselves because all along their earnings had only enabled them to live from hand to mouth.

They are separated from people who know them; from people who could now and again lend them a few cents. Some of them had come from places where they could be helped by both White and Black welfare groups. These groups could embarrass the authorities into doing something about the bad conditions. But none of these things exist at Dimbaza. Here there is no machinery for publicity. They now live a day at a time, grateful for the poor meal—mealie-pap or something—which they manage to find. Many of them of course, receive a pension of about R14,00 every two months. You can work out how much that gives them for each day. And many of you may have read about David Russell's attempt to demonstrate the shocking inadequacies of trying to eke out an existence on this amount of money.

Then there are *the children of Dimbaza*. They have to accompany the old people. You must remember that children are not allowed to live with their parents because they are not productive. In fact, the children are not wanted by the people who employ their parents. Even wives are not allowed to live with their husbands; so they too are sent to Dimbaza. Many of the young men here are too shy to enter into labour contracts and so they return to the farms where working conditions leave much to be desired. In other words: this is a place which is inhabited by *jobless people*. It is a depressing situation. In fact, Dimbaza and other places like it are the consequences of the inhuman migrant labour system.

Inter-Church-Aid is deeply involved in aid and relief work in Dimbaza. In fact, it was here that it launched one of its pilot projects. And Dimbaza now has projects which are inspired by most of the goals which the Border Council of Churches has set itself. We run soup kitchens which cost us R70,00 a month. We help destitute families by supplying them with R5,00 worth of groceries a month. About 150 families receive 50 cents worth of wood each month. We make a grant of R300,00 a year to a Welfare Sub-committee which helps people meet emergencies like burial expenses.

To encourage self-respect and love for home and family life we have a scheme for the development of family grounds and gardens. We usually spend about R120,00 a year on this scheme. In our attempt to foster and develop the moral, mental and physical well-being and education of the people who live at Dimbaza, we are running a Church Community Club. We encourage activities like boxing, judo, weight-lifting, dancing, music

and drama. We employ a social worker to help organize and guide these activities.

### Light industries

We have explored ways in which we can establish light industry in the area. This is essential if we are going to encourage people's sense of self-help, self-reliance and human dignity. The latest development in this field is the successful negotiation of a venture to establish two projects, one at Dimbaza and one at St. Matthews. Both are under complete Black management.

In Dimbaza itself there are three small factories in operation. One is a branch of an East London-based company. Another is sponsored, administered and managed by the Dutch Reformed Church. The third received its initial support from an interest-free capital loan on the recommendation of the Border Council of Churches and was registered as a White company. These three factories have done something to improve the job situation at Dimbaza.

The factory situated at Dimbaza and St. Matthews makes all kinds of garments including Afro-shirts, traditional costumes and school uniforms; and dolls. We are very keen that this kind of venture should receive more support because it is based on the sound community principle of being staffed entirely by Blacks—from workers to management. These Black people are gaining valuable experience in management, administration and finance. And the workers are learning new skills. But what is more important, the scheme is a challenge to them; it fosters self-respect and self-realization. It is, therefore, the kind of venture we would like those who care to support. In this way they can assist a community to develop and to help itself; they can give people "a hand up" instead of merely giving them "a hand out".

Schemes like these should make us pause to evaluate what we are doing in the light of Black opinion. In particular, it is necessary to note that Blacks want to be seen as people and not as objects of some charity or other. For example, the news media usually ask that more jobs should be created in poor areas like Dimbaza instead of asking that *these places be allowed to develop into proper communities*. In other words: if we want to rebuild our twisted and sick society we have to free ourselves from that kind of spiritual bankruptcy which sees a section of our community as tools, as workers, as factory hands.

It is time we all learnt to think of finer qualities like our souls, our spiritual development and our human dignity. This is why the Border Council of Churches decided to switch the emphasis from relief work to creative self-help schemes. We do not propose to make a place like Dimbaza an adopted community which has to depend on the charity of others. We would like to see it develop into a community which can diagnose its problems and work out its own solutions. And we hope that more and more people in South Africa will put their weight behind this kind of Christian Witness. ★



From the "Catholic Worker"

## CHILDREN'S WARD IN THE CISKEI

A hundred babies with old men's faces  
Whimpering, dribbling, four to a cot;  
Is this the devil's incubator?  
Are these the children God forgot?

Swollen bellies and stalk-like navels,  
Shrivelled limbs where the flesh flaps free,  
Small hands twisting and vainly clawing;  
Can these be the heirs of eternity?

Born unwanted, at birth deserted,  
Spawned in a shame few dare confess;  
Hidden, beaten, starved, abandoned,  
Children of lust and loneliness.

This is the land of lonely women  
Who toil in the dusty fields all day  
and please themselves with teenage lovers  
In place of their men-folk far away.

Can this be the promised land of Eden,  
The Homeland where no homes can be,  
From which the men must live in exile  
To earn some rands for their poverty?

May God forgive the unseeing rulers  
Who close their eyes to the black man's lot,  
And may God have pity on loveless babies  
Whimpering, dribbling, four to a cot.

A.G.C.



A personal impression of the All Africa Conference of Churches at Lusaka.

# THE LIBERATION ISSUE

**jane phakathi**

It was a time of emotional anxiety for the South Africans. We discovered that we had never really gone down to the roots of our Christian role—especially that of prophetic Christian witness in the South African situation. I personally noted this point at the very beginning of the Conference. For although Canon Burgess Carr's controversial statement on violence made on the opening day did not receive general approval, one could read through the silence that South Africa was being challenged on several issues:

the necessity of formulating a programme for radical change by non-violent means;

the necessity of combating the institutionalised violence that maintains the oppressive white minority rule in this country.

I sat there as an observer anxiously waiting to hear some practical, constructive and effective alternative spelt out clearly by a South African delegate. I heard nothing except murmurs of rejection of violence, but the question: "Which violence?" still remained in my mind and, I am sure, in the minds of other South African blacks! I felt that the AACC had spelt out clearly its methods of fighting for the liberation of man as a whole, but I doubted whether South African churches had an equal clarity of mind in regard to change by non-violent means. I felt that they were caught up in the same emotional experience of anxiety as I was, the same guilt feelings—as we asked ourselves: "How do we challenge Canon Burgess Carr when we must admit that we never really 'stuck our necks out' to challenge the South African institutionalised violence seriously and effectively; when we never really considered "who is really fighting in self defence at the borders"; and "how do we actually liberate man in South Africa"?

We were certainly taken a back by certain attitudes —

1. The acceptance of white participants by blacks at an Assembly with such a crucial agenda where one would inevitably have expected black hostility and bitterness. It was a lesson for many people.
2. The participation of representatives from the various liberation movements revealed no evidence of black racism. They were people with great love and a deep sense of responsibility; they were deeply concerned about liberation of all people, black and white, and they loved all people equally. Coming from South Africa I could not reconcile this fact with what I usually hear about them through the various propaganda media in South Africa. These things all combined to produce an experience of emotional anxiety.

But make no mistake, they love man to the extent that man either lives—and lives abundantly as Christ proclaimed—or he dies. Thus when the Conference reflected on the oppressive South African system of apartheid, one could not but anticipate a major future clash, with the Portuguese incident as an example of the liberation of the white people bringing in its train the liberation of the black people.



3. In informal discussions between sessions with members of the liberation movements, I asked them what they thought we could do within the country to effect change and their answer was—"Nothing. The South African security measures allow you no alternative". This is what prompted the various questions in my mind: "Who is fighting a just war?" "Who needs whose support?" "Where do South Africans stand?"

In general the Assembly challenged our consciences. Resolutions taken at all levels were concerned with liberation of the total man. The programmes resolved upon were all aimed in this direction.

I observed that Africa was clear about the fact that Christianity was brought to it in terms of the white concept and that for Africans to discover themselves and thereby find liberation, Africa had to find Christianity in terms of the African concept.

It was also clear that Africa—including black South Africa—was hesitant about talking of reconciliation before liberation was achieved—but they were prepared for liberation by peaceful means. Thus when the South African delegation moved that resolutions be amended to include the words: "liberation, justice and reconciliation", it received support, and a special resolution was included which commits South Africa in these words: "That churches, especially the church in South Africa in consultation with the AACC, work for liberation, justice and reconciliation in their countries".

Coming back home I feel that Christians in South Africa are strongly challenged.

We will have to take a stand on our so-called "non-violence"; we have to withstand the institutionalised violence in South Africa. We must be effective or we must admit that we do not really want to liberate man.

I want to put these questions to the churches and Christian bodies in South Africa,

1. When the South African clergy take up duties as chaplains in the army, how do they pronounce their blessings? What comprises the 'just war' that needs their blessing: the S.A. army or the liberation movements or both? Does God 'take sides'?
2. When the 'just war' is over, we have either liberation or submission of the victor and the defeated. On which side will the church be counted if liberation comes? If it does not come, Christ who proclaimed the liberation of man in order to reconcile him with God will come anyway—on which side will the Church in South Africa be counted when He comes?

I feel that while Christians are generally busy with what they believe should be done in South Africa, the Lusaka Assembly brought into sharp focus the specific question: "Where does a South African Christian stand in relation to the complete liberation of man at all levels?" ★

**die kern van die saak**

**NIE MEER  
„ONS MENSE“  
NIE**

**beyers naudé**

Vir baie jare het die Afrikaner hom daarop beroem dat die Kleurling, al is hy bruin van vel, baie nader aan die Afrikaner as aan enige ander volksgroep staan. (Hoe kan dit ook anders as ons daaraan dink dat die Afrikaner tot 'n aansienlike mate verantwoordelik is vir die geboorte en groei van die Kleurling as volksgroep?) Die algemene houding, veral by die Afrikaners van die Bolland, was altyd: „Al is die Kleurling ook gekleur, in wese is hy 'n Bruin Afrikaner; hy praat ons taal; hy lees ons koerante; hy werk op ons plase en in ons huise; hy is deel van ons politiek; hy behoort in aansienlike getalle aan ons Afrikaanse kerkfamilie—jy kan maar sê hy is deel van ons mense!“

Toe kom 1948 met die oorwinning van die Nasionale Party deur die aanwending van sy slagspreuk van apartheid. En stadig maar seker moes die Kleurling ontdek, aanskou en aan sy lyf beleef wat 'n mans bereid is om as offer van ander te eis in sy blinde aanbidding van sy eie afgod—in hierdie geval die afgod van apartheid. Deur die jare is die naam van die afgodstempel keer op keer gewysig: eers was dit apartheid, toe aparte ontwikkeling, toe parallele ontwikkeling, toe selfstandige ontwikkeling, toe selfstandige vryhede—maar terselfertyd is van die Kleurling ge-eis om die een gedwonge offer na die ander op die altaar van hierdie afgodstempel te bring: verteenwoordiging in die Parlement, meedoënloos toepassing van rasse-klassifikasie, die afdwing van greepsgebiede, die „opruiming“ van Distrik Ses, afhokking in 'n paar onaantreklike strande, uitsluiting uit die Nico Malan-teater—met die altyd gepaardgaande versekering: Moenie te gou oordeel nie; wees net 'n bietjie geduldig—die woestyn wat julle nou moet deurkruis is ongelukkig die noodsaaklike lydensweg op pad na die land van belofte! Kyk net wat kry julle alles:

aparte, ruime woonbuurtes, aparte nuwe kerke, aparte skole, aparte universiteite, aparte strande en teaters—ja selfs aparte politieke rade! Wees dankbaar: die dag van verlossing is naby!

Met ongelooflike lydsaamheid, onderworpenheid en geduld het die Kleurlinge buite die afgodstempel van die Blanke gewag. Hoe meer die tyd verbygegaan het, hoe meer is sy geduld verkort, totdat daar vandag geen spoor meer daarvan te vind is nie—in elk geval nie by die leierskap van die gemeenskap nie.

As daar nog enige twyfel bestaan het oor die verskriklike offers wat die apartheidsafgod ge-eis het, dan het Distrik Ses en „Nico Malan” die finale deurslag gegee en is die onlangse oorwinnings van die Arbeidsparty die duidelike antwoord daarop: Moet niks meer van die blanke (insluitende die Afrikaner) te wagte wees nie. Werk julle eie verlossing uit—al is dit met vrees en bewing vir die meedoënlose mag van blanke oorheersing!

Kan daar nog enige twyfel bestaan dat die Afrikaner die Kleurling onherroeplik van homself vervreem het, en daardeur die Kleurling ewe onherroeplik in die kring van swart politieke aspirasies ingedwing het? Ds. Jan Mettler het die spyker op die kop geslaan toe hy die volgende gesê het—Die deure is toe—waaragtig toe! Sonny Leon het na die vrugtelose beraad met die Eerste Minister gesê: „Ek voel bedroef oor die hele saak want ons het ons hand aan die blankes aangebied en hierdie hand is verwerp ... Ons het niks gekry nie ... ons het nou geen ander keuse as om na daardie mense te gaan wie se arms vir ons oop is—die swartmense van Suid-Afrika.” Geen Erika Theron-Kommissie, geen skakelrade of fopspeenkabinette gaan die nuwe geslag van Kleurlinge van die koers wat hul tans ingeslaan het, afdwing of laat terugdraai nie: hulle is besig om self hulle koers te vind op weg na 'n gesamentlike bevryding van die Kleurling en die Swartman—sonder die Afrikaner, sonder die Witman!

Hierdie ontwikkeling gaan nie net die politieke gebeure van ons land diep en ingrypend beïnvloed nie, maar ook die verhouding van die N.G. Kerk (blank) en die N.G. Sendingkerk. Die Sinode van die N.G. Sendingkerk, vergader in Worcester vanaf 18 September en dié van die N.G. Kerk in Kaapstad vanaf 16 Oktober. Ongetwyfeld gaan in die besprekinge by Worcester iets van die nuwe selfstandigheid tot uiting kom, nl. die nuwe vasberadenheid van die Kleurling om sy eie koers te gaan—hand aan hand met die Swartman, (en ook hand aan hand met die Witman wat sy hand in dié van die Swartman en Bruinman wil lê.) Vir die duisende Afrikaners, (ook vir talle van die Afrikaners van die Boland wat hulle in die verlede beroem het op hulle liberale houding teenoor die Kleurling), kan die ontwikkeling van die komende maande in die Kleurling-gemeenskap as 'n groot skok kom. As dit gebeur moet hulle hulself dan net afvra: *Wie* het die deure na die harte van „ons mense” toegeklap? ★

## the root of the matter

# DOUBLE STANDARDS

brian brown

The shorter Oxford Dictionary being too concise to reveal the subtle South African nuances of certain words we use, the following explanations are offered as a service to recent immigrants to the country.

### a terrorist:

When Blacks from Mozambique took up arms against the Government to fight a war of liberation against their Colonial oppressors, they were called—Terrorists.

When Whites from Mozambique took up arms against the Government and used terror tactics to withstand a handing over to Frelimo they were called—Dissidents.

### a patriot:

When South Africans declined to participate in a war on the occasion of Hitler starting a global conflict with inevitable consequences for ourselves, this stand was regarded as of sufficient patriotic merit to earn a burial in Hero's Acre.

When South Africans decline to participate in war on our borders on the grounds of Christian conviction preventing their defending the indefensible, this stand is regarded as unpatriotic, treasonable, and deserving of imprisonment.

### violence:

When the W.C.C. gave humanitarian aid to various guerilla movements in Southern Africa, the Government was quick to call upon churches to disassociate themselves from such un-Christian support of Violence.

When at Hammanskraal Church leaders unanimously called upon members to consider a pacifist response to war in Southern Africa by not involving themselves in the military machine, the Government was

quick to remind every Christian of his duty to be Violent.

**communism:**

When a Christian identifies with his oppressed brother in a desire to support and comfort, he can be banned by the Government for supposedly having aided and promoted Communism.

When the Government creates a society of oppression in which some people begin to feel they have nothing left to lose but their chains, it is not promoting Communism but Nationalism.

**south africans:**

When Blacks from South Africa move north to join the guerilla movements they are no longer South Africans but Kremlin or Peking pawns.

When Blacks from South Africa move north to oppose the guerilla movements on our borders they are of South African origin. ★

**the root of the matter**

FEAR IS  
PART  
OF THE GAME

**theo kotze**

Possibly the gravest danger facing the Church in South Africa at the moment is that we shall become *too cautious*. In other words, that we shall become domesticated.

The implications of, for instance, the Defence Further Amendment Bill are on the one hand so wide-embracing and, on the other hand, so confusing, that Christians will find themselves seriously inhibited in their decision-making and their behaviour, should this in its present form become law.

A new and terrible criterion has already, in many

ways, made itself felt in the courts of the Church viz. "What will the government do?" One hears for example of Church schools who may refuse to admit scholars of other than the white race because the Government *may* withdraw its subsidies. There is no proof but the suggestion is enough to influence the decision.

I have personal experience of a so-called Coloured women's auxiliary being advised by *their minister* that they should not continue a long-standing tradition of visiting and entertaining a so-called white women's auxiliary because it *might* be an infringement of the law. (This is nonsense!)

I know of Christians who never entertain members of another race in their homes simply because they are afraid that this may be against the law. (This is untrue).

There are Christians who hesitate to attend multi-racial parties for the same reason.

There are many employers who travel with their domestics in the back seat of the car because they *think* that this is what the law requires.

The Defence Further Amendment Bill (again, if in its present form it becomes law) will create the same type of dilemma. It could well mean that ministers of the Gospel will ask themselves the following questions:

Can I preach a sermon on what the Bible has to say about peace and war?

Can I ask my congregation, or any group, in that congregation, to consider the morality, or futility, of war?

Can I advise a young person who feels deeply about these things (and many do) to obey his Christian conscience and not take up arms?

Can I even discuss the subject with my family, my friends and my people?

All these decisions are (or may be) influenced by uncertainty and governed by fear.

Are we sure that this is not part of the game? To create an atmosphere of uncertainty and fear in which the Church will be subservient to lesser ends than that of obedience to the Gospel?

The crunch question for Christians right now is: "Do we obey God or men?" "Do not model yourselves on the behaviour of the world around you, but let your behaviour change, modelled by your new mind. This is the only way to discover the will of God and know what is good, what it is that God wants, what is the perfect thing to do." (Romans 12.2 Jerusalem Bible)

Surely this means

- that we affirm in our living, in our daily attitudes and behaviour what we know in our hearts to be the truth of the Gospel.
- that we shall not allow traditional attitudes, imposed customs or, it may be, statutory laws to inhibit our obedience to the One Lord in whom we claim to believe, even Jesus Christ.★

## **the root of the matter**

# THE STATE vs THE CHURCH

**peter randall**

The dimensions of a Church-State confrontation already exist in South Africa. This confrontation is likely to sharpen as the country moves deeper into the crisis caused by the racist policies of the government.

The roots of confrontation lie in the conflicting viewpoints of the State, which seeks to demand the total unquestioning and blind obedience of all its subjects (including their willingness to kill or die even if their consciences forbid this), and of the Church, which must maintain that the Christian's ultimate loyalty is to God and that when the demands of the State and of God's law are in conflict he must obey the latter.

It would be naive to believe that as our crisis deepens, as external threats and guerilla attacks mount and as internal tensions reach breaking point, the government will not increasingly come to regard sections of the church as a threat, and that it will not seek to exercise greater control over them.

Recent South African history has seen the government moving systematically to crush the non-racial trade union movement as expressed in SACTU, the mass black political organisations like the ANC and the PAC, the multi-racial political parties like the Liberal Party, the white student dissidents in NUSAS, and the Black Consciousness movement as expressed through SASO, the Black Peoples Convention and the Black Community Programs. Allied with this is of course the constant threatening of the English language press. The government has ruthlessly and steadily sought to destroy all effective opposition outside of the conservative white political parties. Why then should it stop at the Church? It has already shown its callous disregard of the church by subjecting church workers from abroad to

restrictions which do not apply to other categories of visiting workers, by deporting Anglican bishops, by banning books on theology, by banning and house-arresting priests and ministers, by seizing the passports of clergy and church workers, by setting police on to students seeking refuge in cathedrals, and by subjecting the former dean of Johannesburg to a political trial which revealed the existence of spies and paid informers within the very councils of the church itself.

The response of the Church to all this has been remarkably patient and restrained. But undoubtedly it has had a radicalising effect. So have the actions of world Christendom which has now generally lost hope of any peaceful change in South Africa because of the governing regime's intransigence. The growth of a new-found confidence and strength among black Church members (who form the majority of each established Church) is another factor in the growing radicalisation of the Church. Governments which call themselves Christian do not lightly risk the opprobrium of a frontal attack on the Church, and so it is likely that the South African regime will pursue a flanking approach to try to harass and destroy first those individuals and organisations it regards as peripheral to the main body of the Church (although the "Church" is ultimately all those in the fellowship of Christ).

In this light one should see the Schlebusch operation against the Christian Institute— in which the government has the added bonus of collaboration from the United Party, the personal attacks on the Rev. Douglas Bax and the Rev. Beyers Naudé for introducing the Hammanskraal resolution on conscientious objection, the vilification of the Wilgespruit Fellowship Centre, the harassment of Spro-cas and its staff, the banning of theologians like Dr Manas Buthelezi and the steady stream of propaganda against the World Council of Churches, the South African Council of Churches, the "social gospel" etc., as well as the constant propaganda in favour of confused people who are trying to create opposition groups to the SACC or who bring raving right wingers from other countries to South Africa to frighten us out of our Christian wits with red scare stories.

The main body of the Church fails to take note of these developments at their peril. What happens to the Church's outriders to-day will happen to them to-morrow. The state is insatiable in its quest for blind obedience and docile conformity. ★



## the root of the matter

# IS THE CHURCH IRRELEVANT?

roelf meyer

The greatest danger of the D.R.C. and the Church in general at the moment is that it is possibly *irrelevant* with regard to the real problems of our society in the fields of politics, economics and social life, and in relation to violence in the South African set-up of Black and White. We are facing a desperate situation *now* and unless the D.R.C. Synod speaks in vital words and suits its actions to the words, it will be reduced to merely following events and history and will play no vital part in their making.

As Christianity is an historical religion, the essence of it being the life, death and resurrection of the *historical*

Christ, the Church must relate its message and principles to the historical interaction now of word and deed—it must speak a timely word and carry into action a timely deed.

The vital problems of our society which must be tackled at the coming synod meetings of the N.G. Kerk and N.G. Sendingkerk and for which there is scope in their agenda, are the following: The message of and action for *unity*. The fragmentation of the Church is causing it to lose integrity, power and influence. The deep and disastrous division along the colour line in South Africa, is causing society to be threatened as it were with a time-bomb and time is running out. The whole situation of disunity, fragmentation, division and apartness must be reversed to one of *koinonia* (fellowship, unity, sharing and co-operation).

The large number of *strikes* (300 in 18 months), the political inability of society to solve the problems of the relationship between White and Coloured people, the urban Blacks and the poverty-stricken homelands, the attempt to solve our problems with structural and military violence, the flight of many S.W. Africans and South Africans from South Africa, the war escalating on our borders—all these call for urgent action on various fronts including the Church. The Church must embark upon a massive campaign for liberation, justice and peace. One way of achieving this would be by calling a national convention of leaders of all groups to provide the opportunity of meaningful dialogue leading to change.

If the White N.G. Kerk and the Coloured N.G. Sendingkerk Synods are able to break the vicious circle of race prejudice, fear and domination and the grip of the status quo, and apply the principles of the gospel boldly to our situation with regard to the questions of political rights, mixed marriage, the practical unity of the church, equality of opportunity, and in the field of labour—salaries and wages and labour unions, then a vital change and renewal of hope for everyone in South Africa would follow. But if this does not happen, these Churches will increasingly become part of the problem, and if the dilemma is not solved pretty soon, it might be too late to stop the resulting disaster. Nothing less than the integrity of the Church as the body of Christ on earth is at stake—the Church with its vital message of life and salvation through Jesus Christ. ✱



# A MAN FORCED INTO A VACUUM

**an interview  
with franco**

*Mr Franco Frescura, an architectural student at Wits University, and a well-known cartoonist has been deprived of his South African citizenship. As Pro Veritate has also used some of his art work and labour, we have asked him for an interview so that we may know the person beyond the cartoonist better. More important, however, is the message to our society which he presents, particularly through the medium of drawing.*

Q.: Franco, first of all please tell us a little about yourself and your background.

A.: I was born 28 years ago in Trieste, Italy. Both my parents originated from what is now Yugoslav territory, but were forced to flee from there towards the end of the war when my grandfather was killed by communist partisans. We lived in Trieste for a few years and then in Rome until 1956 when we emigrated to South Africa where I have been ever since. I renounced my Italian citizenship for a South African one in 1969 and married a local girl in 1970.

Q.: Therefore, having lived in South Africa for two-thirds of your life, you feel your future is in this country?

A.: Irrevocably so. My whole education, background, family, accent, politics and mother-in-law are all South African and I think that all my statements and actions over the past few years indicate that not only have I committed my future to that of this country but that I am keen to take an active part in shaping its destiny.

Q.: I know that many modern young people do not want to call themselves Christians because they do not agree with the traditional stand of the Churches in supporting the status quo in South Africa. They are, however, often perhaps very sincere Christians. Would you call yourself a Christian and do you belong to a specific Church?

A.: I believe that my values and way of life are Christian. I am not however a Christian in the accepted sense that I subscribe to the tenets of one particular faith. I believe instead in subscribing to the broad principles of the Gospel which stand undiluted by human prejudice and politics. Therefore, although I was born within the Catholic Church, and was baptised, confirmed and married within it, I find that I am often at odds with many of the stands it takes that have nothing to do with the teachings of Christianity and indeed many times I believe run contrary to them. Therefore, while this probably does not make me a good Catholic, it does not necessarily make me a bad Christian.

Q.: Do you think that the situation in South Africa with regard to racial injustice would change if the Christians and Churches were to apply Christianity with sincerity also to the political field?

A.: I believe that too many people today have placed religion before Gospel, believing them to be one and the same thing. This has resulted in an emphasis on certain values and distortion of others which people have either bluffed themselves or have been bluffed by others into believing that those are true Christian values. This has in turn resulted in claims by politicians of heavenly support for their policies. In our particular case, a number of

churches support the political system of Apartheid when I believe that apartheid is anathema, and certainly not compatible with true Christian values. I have as yet to discover where the Gospel permits the breaking up of families, bannings and detention without trial, to mention but a few. It is inevitable that if the Church were to preach and practice sincere Christian values, the present situation in South Africa is bound to improve. It would be naive of us however to see this as the solution to the total problem. Developing sincere Christian values is but the beginning of initiating more sweeping and radical reforms and must be seen as a launching platform rather than an end in themselves.

Q.: What changes would you like to see in South Africa in general? Or to put it another way, what type of society would you like to see and work for in South Africa?

A.: The only system I personally would find acceptable is one which will inevitably mean the total revision of our statutes and constitution and which must result in a fundamental, radical change of the present structure of society and government. I support the right of every South African, whatever his race, sex, colour, creed or political persuasion to pursue his life style and ambitions free from arbitrary curbs and imposed values. This means a universal franchise, the unrestricted right of choice of association and marriage, the right to worship what and where he pleases, the freedom of expression, visual, mental, vocal and written, a guaranteed minimum wage with state subsidies in the fields of health, law and housing, the right to collective bargaining powers, unrestricted travel, equality on all statutes and before the law ... need I say more? The only limitation that I would place on society is that no individual or group may impose his values, quirks and foibles on the rest of society.

Q.: Does your work as cartoonist provide enough opportunity for you to do something positive about the situation?

A.: There is tremendous scope in South Africa as indeed almost everywhere else in the world for the visual message as a means of communicating ideas and concepts. A simple graphic can condense volumes into a brief message which can be comprehended almost universally

The advantages are obvious. A book requires interest and money to acquire it, concentration to read it and the ability to comprehend it. A poster only requires being displayed. This was probably the reason why some Spro-cas books ended up largely unread on some white persons' coffee tables, symbols of liberal patronage whilst the Spro-cas posters, although presenting a simplistic message, caused widespread interest and sometimes



controversy and furore. Ideas are, after all, free.

Q.: Would you care to tell us what your actual position is with regard to your citizenship or lack of citizenship?

A.: I received a letter from the Secretary of the Interior about three months ago informing me that the Minister had removed my citizenship from me. The reason given was that I had incurred a criminal record within the stipulated period of five years since being granted the citizenship. As I had renounced all rights to an Italian citizenship when I took out a South African one, I knew that despite what the Minister's letter stated, I did not automatically revert back to my original citizenship. This was confirmed by the Italian embassy. Two weeks ago I received a further note from the Minister's secretary informing me that the Minister was neither prepared to review his decision nor grant me an interview. My lawyer informs me that this has effectively rendered me stateless, with no identification or travel documents.

Q.: Is your wife a South African citizen?

A.: Yes, indeed. Her family can trace their roots back in this country to about 1823 when they landed in the Cape, having sailed from England. All of her family have fought for South Africa. Her grandfather was a Lieut. Colonel whilst an uncle was awarded the D.F.C. and bar as a fighter pilot.

Q.: What are you going to do about the situation in which you find yourself?

A.: Absolutely nothing. To suddenly declare that I am no longer a South African does not deny that I am still one. I must admit, I am saddened by the loss of



travel documents. However, other than that, I have every intention of carrying on as if nothing had happened. My attitude has not changed; thus nothing has changed.

Q.: Actually you apologised to the prime minister and leader of the opposition when you were convicted because of some drawings about a year ago. After the sentence imposed had been carried out and you had made your apologies they still went on to punish you further. This obviously looks as if the government in general does not approve of your work. Two questions arise out of this:

Firstly, what do you think of censorship in South Africa and the norms on which it is based? And Secondly, as you acknowledged that you were in the wrong in regard to some drawings, what norms do you apply in your art work?

A.: I think that censorship in any guise or form is abhorrent. I know that you and I disagree on this, Roelf, and I am prepared to grant you that in the case of children, parental guidance should in some cases be exercised. I do not however agree with the general trend in this country to regard all of its citizens as children subject to the gentle cosseting of the 'great white Father'.

I am especially disturbed by the way the white regime frowns upon anything smacking even remotely of sex whilst allowing the greatest pornography of all, violence, to flow unchecked into the country, via radio, films, and other mass media. This, I think, is a true guide to our values. Almost daily we are told of how our children are being corrupted by pornography, obscenity, brazen

nudity, streaking and immorality. At the same time we are perpetrating an apartheid system which I feel is more obscene than any 'blue film'. I can think of few acts more immoral than breaking up of families via a migrant labour system and more brazen than talking about "equal rights" to the foreign press and 'white leadership' to the people of the platteland. The only thing I want to save my children from is the insidious conditioning that passes for education in this country. Censorship in South Africa is not a way of protecting our youth but a means of maintaining political power and quashing opposition.

As to the norms I use as guide-lines in my work, I am going to risk your readers' sarcasm by saying that I have as few as possible. There are however a few non-standards I try to keep to.

I like to think that I have a healthy disregard for society's institutionalized 'Holy cows'. This means keeping as open a mind as possible to enable their identification and subsequent graphic demise. This necessitates to a large extent a feeling for critical behaviour, for if a cartoonist is to be effective, he must be able to look at all aspects of society about him. In turn this requires total impartiality—after all injustice or foolishness remains the same whatever its perpetrator's shade of political opinion. The liberal left is just as open to comment and ridicule as is the nationalist right. Also I deny the right of any public servant to shield behind his position—a politician is after all paid by public funds and must be responsible to the public at all times.

Another point is that I have a total lack of regard for the laws of copyright unless the ideas copied are used for the financial gain of others. Once an idea is published and seen, it is retained in the mind and therefore becomes public property.

Q.: How do you see the future of South Africa, and your own future in this situation as an artist?

A.: I have no future anywhere as either cartoonist or artist. I do not think of myself as either. My future lies in the field of architecture and once I have graduated I want to spend a few years overseas furthering my experience.

However I am convinced that the present white regime in South Africa is coming to a rapid end. The sudden fall of Portugal in Mozambique must stand as a lesson to all of us. And when the present system is replaced, it will mean a considerable amount of work to reshape our society according to its true needs and to rectify all the errors we are going to be left as a legacy by the present government. There are houses, schools and hospitals to be built and this is where I foresee my future involvement. ★



## **briewe aan die redakteur**

# **DIE KERK I.P.V. DIE STAAT MOET LEI**

Die artikel in die Julie-uitgawe van Pro Veritate in „Geweeg en ...?” onder die opskrif „Praat harder, Ds., ons hoor jou nie ...” (Die Vaderland 4.6.'74) i.v.m. die kwessie „Die Kerk wil nie die staat regeer nie en die Staat wil nie die Kerk ignoreer nie” is van groot belang. Daar behoort eintlik nie 'n probleem te wees nie. Die „probleem” ontstaan omdat daar verwarring is tussen die doel, of lievers die funksie, van die Kerk en dié van die Staat.

Eerstens, wat is Godsdien? Dis nie alleen om die Kerk by te woon nie, dis selfs nie eers om gereeld te bid nie. Nee, dis baie meer, dis 'n persoon se bewustheid van God en sy vertrou in sy Goddelike leiding en 'n sekerheid dat dit wat hy glo, die Waarheid is.

Wat is politiek? Dis niks meer as 'n verskeidenheid van opinies nie, saamgevat in verskillende groepe (partye) wat dan deur middel van wette bepaal wat hulle dink die beste leiding vir die land is.

Suid-Afrika is nie vry van buitelandse invloed nie en ook hier neem die Staat in alle opsigte van ons lewe en leefwyse al meer en meer beheer oor.

Die Kerk staan altyd onder Gods leiding en werk daarvolgens. Nie so lank gelede nie was die leiding en invloed van ons Kerk sterker as vandag. Toe kon die Kerk aanneem dat die lede van die staatsdiens almal godsdienstig is en hy het dus vertrou gehad dat hulle met dieselfde godsdienstige beginsels sou optree as dié

van die Kerk. Vandag is dit nie so nie.

Die Kerk staan dus verbysterd en kyk na die leiding wat die Staat gee. Die persoon se getrouheid aan die Staat is nog daar, maar daar is iets verkeerd. Ja, daar is iets ernstig verkeerd, en dit is dat die politiek, of beter gestel, die Staat, die leiding neem in plaas van Godsdien. Gepaard met Godsdien gaan die erkenning van dié geestelike en nie die waansinnige klem op die wêreldse nie. Met godsdien aan die stuur val alles in die regte plek, want sake word vanuit die hoogste oogpunt beskou en nie vanuit die laagste nie. Dit beteken nie dat die Kerk die Regering moet wees nie, maar dat die Kerk as leier aan elkeen 'n standvastigheid moet gee en 'n kennis van wat reg is. Op dié manier is die Kerk die leier van die volk.

As daar 'n probleem ontstaan, is dit omdat die Kerk vergeet het wat sy eerste beginsels is en nie getrou daaraan was nie. Solank as wat ons die Waarheid preek sal alles reg wees. Elkeen herken die Waarheid instinktief.

Ons dominees hoef alleen self seker te wees dat dit wat hulle verkondig die Waarheid is, dan sal ons saam met hulle glo, maar twyfel hulle, dan twyfel die hele gemeente saam met hulle, en dan is die godsdien nie meer 'n lewende godsdien nie, maar alleen 'n holle rite.

D.S. van den Bergh

# **HAMMANSKRAAL IS NIE STAATSONDERMYNEND NIE**

Pro Veritate is een van die blaaië wat die lewe nog die moeite werd maak. Ek vind die laaste positiewe stap, die standpunt oor militêre diens as uiters heldhaftig en opreg.

Ek glo nie die Ned. Geref. Kerk het enige reg om kritiek te lewer nie, al is ek lid van dié kerk, aangesien die kerk besig is om aan apartheid te sterwe, Christus sou sulke toestande nooit geduld het nie, al klink dit miskien godslasterlik om dit te sê.

Die Verenigde Party het ewe-min teen Hammanskraal in te bring want die politiek het nog nooit na die waarheid gevra nie, maar alleen hoe om die mag wat nodig is, te verkry. Mag is daarvolgens die wet en die wet

sorg dat daardie oorwinnende mag aan die bewind bly.

Daar sal natuurlik moeilikheid oor Hammanskraal wees soos 'n mens dit reeds oor die radio hoor en in die nuusblaaie lees dat een of ander kerk of persoon aangehaal word wat ook teen Hammanskraal se besluit is. Selfs die eerste minister het sy onaangename deel daarvoor te sê gehad.

Ek kan niks in die Hammanskraal besluit vind wat die Staat sou ondermyn nie; miskien wel die Nasionale Party.

Dr Francois Möller.

# WEIGHED AND ...?

## 'CHANGE THROUGH PEACE'

The Defence Further Amendment Bill could "spell the beginning of the end of church freedom in South Africa." This warning was issued in a statement to the SUNDAY TIMES this week by the four leaders of the Christian Institute, Dr C.F.B. Naudé, the Rev. Theo Kotze, the Rev. Roelf Meyer and the Rev. Brian Brown.

The hard-hitting statement called for an urgent meeting between Black and White people of all opinions to examine and implement methods of achieving peaceful change in South Africa.

It also posed this question: "If the most powerful military force in the world could not win the Vietnam War and if Portugal could not win the 13-year conflict in Mozambique and Angola, what realistic hope is there for South Africa?"

It reads: "Public and critical assessment of society, based on the Gospel of Jesus Christ, is an essential task of Christendom as reflected in the books of Acts and Revelations. The proposed legislation will obstruct this fundamental task.

"It will also restrict the pastoral duty of Christian ministers and it will inhibit their counselling role. We cannot and dare not surrender our duty to be pastors to the flock of Christ—and this includes the task of encouraging young people to face moral issues.

### Consequences

"There are serious issues of conscience at stake when it comes to Christian participation in any war, at any time and in any place. Apart from its serious implications for the Church in South Africa, if this law is passed it will have a number of inevitable consequences."

The statement says that such a law would plunge more and more young people into crises of conscience and make it impossible for any of them to decide between the demands of God for justice and the demands of their fatherland for unconditional loyalty.

As the conflict on the borders claimed more and more lives on both sides, an increasing number of young Whites, denied alternatives to military service, might leave South Africa to seek a future elsewhere.

Others would take part in the conflict with inner turmoil and bitterness. A small percentage possibly would refuse on the grounds of conscience to take up arms and would serve prison sentences.

"What will any of this achieve?" asks the statement. "The proposed legislation will not promote the peace of Christ in men's lives and men's affairs.

The new law would also create sharper polarisation between Black and White in the church, because it was mainly Whites who rejected the spirit of the Hammanskraal decision, and mainly Blacks who supported it. The Government would be driving a wedge between Blacks and Whites which would obstruct Christian reconciliation.

More and more young Blacks who still believed in the possibility of peaceful change would, as was happening in South West Africa leave South Africa to offer their services to those fighting on the other side. The Government, thereby, would be achieving exactly the opposite of the intention of the Bill and would strengthen the guerilla forces.

The statement continued: "Reaction to the Hammanskraal resolution from the Government and from White church and other leaders, has in a sense done what the resolution asked for, it has drawn attention to the basic issues involved in the borders conflict far better and among far more people than could ever have been done by the churches alone.

"But this reaction has avoided the real issues on which the decision was based. It is imperative that a meeting of Black and White people of all shades of opinion be called to examine and implement the methods of peaceful change on the grounds of the evangelical demands of justice and peace. We appeal urgently to all responsible leaders to heed this call."

The statement adds: "Among countries which are not totalitarian or communist, South Africa is virtually alone in not allowing alternative ways of national service to those who conscientiously object to being part of the military.

"We urgently call on the Government to take the positive step of providing conscientious objectors with the opportunity of performing non-military service while others are training for—or fighting—the war."

# GEWEEG EN ...?

The important question that was going to be asked more frequently in the future was whether the conflict on the borders would increasingly involve unnecessary loss of life.

"If the most powerful military force in the world could not win the Vietnam War and if Portugal could not win the 13-year conflict in Mozambique and Angola, what realistic hope is there for South Africa?"

"All these struggles could lead to are developing tension and a crisis situation. Concerned people will increasingly ask whether there is no possibility of a peaceful solution—whether it is necessary to sacrifice precious lives."

The statement concludes, "It would be fatal in these circumstances to take another retrogressive step through the proposed legislation. What we desperately need is a programme of active peace-making in obedience to the Gospel of Christ. 'Blessed are the peace-makers'."

### A GOVERNMENT AFRAID OF IDEAS

Last month, with publication of the second Schibusch-Le Grange report on Nusas, the Government finally bowed to the widespread public unease and anger over the commission's methods of operation and the unjustness of the banning of eight student leaders. Thus the Prime Minister announced that the report was being submitted to the Attorney-General for consideration; if the evidence warranted it, criminal proceedings would follow in the courts.

Now, however, before any legal view has become known, the Government has pre-empted the normal processes of law. It has declared Nusas "affected" under the recently-enacted Affected Organizations Act. Nusas is debarred from receiving funds from abroad and its financial operations are subject to close scrutiny and control. Nusas was not consulted before the Government acted; it was not given the opportunity of challenging the information which the Minister of Justice considered in reaching his decision. Once more there has been a form of secret trial, with the Government itself acting out the roles of prosecution, defence and judge.

It will no doubt be claimed that the decision is based on the commission's latest report. But that report is totally unacceptable. It could not be otherwise because it derives from Star-Chamber type procedures, with secret witnesses, hearings behind closed doors and concealment of the full proceedings.

Why has the Government acted so precipitately and arbitrarily? What is it afraid of? Is Nusas such a power in the land that even the awesome sweep of Nationalist-created "security" legislation is insufficient to deal with possible transgressions? Of course not. This all-mighty Government can cope with anything which Nusas may do. But what the Government does fear are the ideas which Nusas puts forward—perhaps ineptly, even stupidly on occasion, but still ideas which can cause South Africans to think again about their comfortable status quo. That is Nusas' real crime.

In taking its vengeful, punitive action, however, the Government not only reveals its fear but also its shortsightedness. For it forgets that ideas propounded by Nusas 10 or 15 years ago, on matters ranging from dialogue to "petty apartheid", are today widely accepted, even by the Nationalists themselves. And with events moving so swiftly in Southern Africa, perhaps the

seemingly radical ideas of to-day will be utterly acceptable next year or the year after.

The essential point is that ideas are needed if South Africa is to move smoothly into the future. Thinking young people must be encouraged, not suppressed.

—Rand Daily Mail, 16.9.74.

### S.A. KAN OORLOG NIE REGVERDIG

Geagte Redaksie—

In die Transvaler van 6.9.74 het dr Willem de Klerk in sy rubriek Kortom die standpunt dat S.A. 'n „regverdige oorlog” aan sy grense voer, en dat die staat dus die reg het om sy burgers te dwing tot militêre diensplig, gehandhaaf.

Daarteenoor moet die volgende gestel word:

S.A. voer basies 'n burger-oorlog aan sy grense; vir dié oorlog is daar 'n Christelike alternatief, nl. sinvolle dialoog wat tot wesenlike verandering móet lei.

Die staat kan van sy burgers verwag om 'n samelewing wat op geregtigheid en vryheid gebaseer is, in stand te hou, maar hy handel onchristelik indien hy sy burgers sonder meer dwing om 'n basies onregverdige maatskappy met geweld te verdedig.

Die Christen en die kerk mag nie onaktief wees om in 'n samelewing wat op geforseerde „afsonderlike ontwikkeling” gebou word, hulle Christelike getuieis in woord en daad vir vreedsame, radikale verandering te lewer nie. Geregtigheid teenoor almal moet die basis vorm, en nie 'n ideologie wat deur 'n klein minderheid op 'n groot meerderheid, sonder sinvolle seggenskap van die meerderheid, afgedwing word nie.

Die kernpunt van die hele stryd op die oomblik is dat die blanke, soos dr de Klerk, die oorlog as Christelik verdedigbaar sien, terwyl die swarte (hoofsaaklik) die summere verdediging van die onregverdige maatskappy as onchristelik beskou. Indien ons mekaar nie op hierdie punt vind nie, sal ons mekaar glad nie vind nie.

'n „Regverdige oorlog” kan alleen gevoer word indien daar geen ander moontlikheid oorbly om verandering te bewerk nie. Ook moet daar 'n bereikbare doel in die oorlog wees.

Indien 'n mens die punte van die teorie van 'n „regverdige oorlog” op S.A. toepas, geld nie een vir die grensoorlog nie:

1. 'n Wettige gesag moet oorlog voer—S.A. het egter 'n minderheidsregering wat op die swart bevolking afgedwing word.
2. Dit moet om 'n regverdige saak gaan—dit gaan egter hier om die verdediging van 'n basiese onregverdige rassistiese sisteem in S.A. met geen nabye uitsig op wesenlike verandering nie.
3. Dit moet om dié orde, reg en vryheid gevoer word—dié stryd word egter juis in S.A. gevoer om die huidige bestel met sy onreg, dwang en wanorde—vergelyk bv. trek-arbeid se chaotiese uitwerking op die gesinslewe—te verdedig.
4. Die wyse van oorlogvoering moet aan die eise van medemenslikheid voldoen—moderne oorlogvoering sluit dié moontlikheid uit.
5. Oorlog is moontlik alleen regverdigbaar indien daar

geen ander wyse is om die probleem op te los nie—in S.A. wil die regering en die blankes wat hom ondersteun, nie wesenlike Godgegewe regte, wat hulle self geniet, aan die swart bevolking toelaat nie.

6. Oorlog is moontlik regverdigbaar indien daar 'n bereikbare doelwit in sig is—Viëtnam en Mosambiek het onteenseglik getoon dat sulke oorloë jare lank uitgerek word met onnodige menseverlies sonder om die guerilla-oorlog te wen.

### Verloëning

Ten slotte is dit uiters belangrik dat aangetoon word dat die kerk nooit die teorie van 'n „regverdige oorlog” aanvaar het nie. Christus het gesterf om alle doodslag te beëindig. Indien geweld en oorlog nou die basis van jou samelewing vorm, en indien wetgewing ingestel moet word om selfs die verkondiging van 'n alternatiewe oplossing te stuit, grens dit aan 'n verloëning van Jesus Christus en sy boodskap van vrede.

ROELF MEYER, V.D.M.,

Redakteur van Pro Veritate, en Studie-sekretaris van die Christelike Instituut, Johannesburg.

(Brief verkort)

—*Die Transvaler*, 11.9.74.

### 'I CAN'T BE LOYAL TO WHITE SA'

CAPE TOWN. — Mr David Curry, deputy leader of the Labour Party, said yesterday: "I cannot offer White South Africa my loyalty. I cannot offer the blood of my child on our borders, because when he dies he is a South African, when he lives he is a Coloured".

He was speaking during the no confidence debate in the Coloured Representative Council.

—*Rand Daily Mail*, 23.7.74.

### PHATUDI HITS AT 'SPIES'

PIETERSBURG. — The Chief Minister of Lebowa, Dr C.N. Phatudi, strongly attacked the Government for allowing its information department to 'infiltrate the Lebowa homeland with spies' when he addressed 2 000 people at the Seshego Stadium yesterday.

Dr Phatudi said there were all kinds of spies, Black and White, and informers throughout Lebowa and he did not understand what they wanted. All relevant information could be obtained from him without any trouble.

He also attacked the policy of separate development and said this would not lead to any solution to the problems of South Africa.

### False concept

"It seems the White man fears every Black man and always assumes the Black man is preparing to annihilate him," he said.

This is a totally false concept of ideas in this modern world.

That is why we in Lebowa believe in co-operative development instead of the separate development practised by Pretoria."

The Chief Minister spoke of his dissatisfaction with the Government's proposals on consolidation. It was unfair for the Black man to own only 13 percent of the country, while the White man owns 87 percent.

—*The Star*, 9.9.74.

### FUTILE AIM

"Whites would do well to note the flat statement to British newsmen by Dr Cedric Phatudi, of Lebowa, and Professor Hudson Ntsanwisi, of Gazankulu, that apartheid has failed. Their plea for British understanding of their position as 'non-stooges' who are not a part of apartheid apparatus but who cannot voice Black aspirations from any other platform, is significant because for the first time they have addressed it not to South Africans but to people abroad.

Despite years of conditioning, virtually all Black leaders have now rejected ethnic grouping and junior partnership status in favour of a broad South Africanism. And they are tired of saying so at home.

It is imperative for White South Africa to recognise this."

—*Sunday Tribune*, 1.9.74.

### STATEMENT

Conscientious objection to all war or preparation for war has always been and still is a basic and integral part of the Quaker understanding and propagation of Christian faith and practice. We support all men in their right to share with one another in open discussion on matters of conscience.

Through generations of experience our members have found that disputes are only ultimately resolved when both conflicting parties come together in discussion with faith in the good in each other.

Discussion reveals the causes of conflict, which can then be resolved without war provided that the parties are prepared to make sacrifices.

Just as war requires courage and sacrifice, so peaceful solutions will require courage and sacrifice.

On behalf of Transvaal Monthly Meeting of the Society of Friends (Quakers).

—*Olive Gibson*, 23.8.74.

### NON-WHITE NG CHURCHES WANT TO JOIN SACC

The Three non-White branches of the Nederduitse Gereformeerde Kerk (NGK) are to recommend to their synods that they join the South African Council of Churches, which came under fire from the Prime Minister, Mr Vorster, and the Minister of Defence, Mr P.W. Botha, after its annual conference at Hammanskraal recently.

*Sunday Times*, 18.8.74.

## **"KEI INDEPENDENCE IS ONLY A WORD"—PROFESSOR**

The Transkei had no Blacks with the political and economic skills to ask for independence, a wellknown political scientist, Professor W.A. Kleynhans, said yesterday...

"He said the Transkei was neither stable politically nor economically. The homeland had no Blacks with such expertise or skills.

The Transkei had a long way to go before it would become stable.

"While the Transkei is still dependant on South Africa economically, and it will remain so for a long time, if I were Chief Matanzima I would not push for independence"...

—*Rand Daily Mail*, 22.8.74.

## **SACC's ARMY CALL 'A FORM OF PATRIOTISM'**

CAPE TOWN.—In a full-page article in this week's edition of the student newspaper, *Varsity*, Reverend Theo Kotze, the Cape director of the Christian Institute, replied to criticism of the South African Council of Churches' Hammanskraal motion on conscientious objection.

"Some very important issues have been completely lost. I want to spell out what I understand to be the central issues facing us all," he said.

Quoting at length from the Bible, he said it was up to the individual to decide on conscientious objection.

"All South Africans devoted to justice and called upon to fight on the border must consider whether or not the cause is just—in fact they must decide".

Rev. Kotze discussed the differences between an unjust and a just war and says the criticism was whether the cause involved was a "fight for justice, a defence of a just situation or the liberation of those suffering injustice".

Explaining his view on South Africa's present situation, he said: "It is clear that all of us in SA are already living in a situation of violence.

"There is violence on our borders, violence within the country. Whites readily accept the former, but most reject the latter, even though this is the daily experience of Blacks within the country."

He defended the motion on conscientious objection as another form of patriotism.

"Conscientious objection is an alternative way of laying your life on the line for the sake of your country and for the peace of the world.

"It is saying that you are willing to make a sacrifice from peace but in a peaceful way, that you are willing to combat evil but in a non-violent way."

This week's issue of *Varsity* was almost entirely devoted to South African defence matters.

In another full-page article entitled "Is this the way we go?" an analogy is drawn between the wars in Portuguese Africa and the war on South Africa's borders.

"While the causes of the Portuguese war are expounded at

length, we (South Africa) refuse to see any analogy between the Portuguese and South African situations,

"Portugal has recognised the cause of its wars and these wars are ending, but only after thousands have been killed. South Africa and Rhodesia continue to deny the cause of the fighting and their citizens continue to die," the article said.

"Why is it that Black South Africans support the SACC (Hammanskraal) resolution and the WCC? Why is it that White South Africans generally do not?"

The newspaper also quotes at length from the South African Defence White Paper and the Lusaka Manifesto.

—*Rand Daily Mail*, 24.8.74.

## **RAVAN PRESS CASE QUASHED**

The Suppression of Communism Act case against Dr C.F. Beyers Naudé and two other directors of Ravan Press was thrown out by a Johannesburg Regional Court magistrate today.

Dr. Naude, the Rev. Danie van Zyl and Mr. Peter Randall had all been charged as directors of Ravan Press, together with the company itself, with publishing statements by former NUSAS president, Mr Paul Pretorius, who was banned on February 26, 1973.

The case—popularly called the "Pritt-stick case"—related to a Press digest printed last year with an introduction by Mr. Pretorius. Evidence was that a strip of paper had been glued over the statement after Mr. Pretorius was banned. After the State case closed more than two months ago, Mr. J.C. Kriegler (for the defence) applied for discharge because, he said, the digest had been printed before Mr. Pretorius was banned.

Evidence had been that the banning order was served in Grahamstown at 4 p.m. on February 26, 1973

The magistrate, Mr. P.H.S. van Zyl, said in his judgment today the statement could easily be read by lifting the piece of paper which had been stuck over it. But the charge against Ravan Press was that it printed the document unlawfully and this had not been shown.

He found all the accused not guilty and discharged them.

Mr. J.C. Kriegler, SC, with him Mr. D.M. Williamson instructed by Bowman, Gilfillan and Blacklock, defended. Mr. L.C. Kotzé appeared for the State.

—*The Star*, 22.8.74.

## **SOUTH AFRICA'S PENTECOSTAL INDIANS**

Eleven per cent of the Indian population of South Africa—some 70 370 people—are Christians, compared with an average of little more than six per cent up to the year 1960.

Islam and Hinduism have grown very little among South Africa's Indians in the last 50 years, but Christianity has had a remarkable growth, largely due to the preaching of South Africa's Pentecostal Churches.

These conclusions are drawn by Professor G.C. Oosthuizen of the department of Science of Religion at the Indian University of Durban, after research into religious trends among Indians in Durban lasting four years.

Only a tiny proportion of the Indians who began arriving in South Africa just over a century ago were Christians. By 1921 Christian evangelism had produced 11 000 Indian Christians, about 6 per cent of the Indian population. In 1951, the 23 000 Indian Christians still represented only 6,7 per cent of all Indians and in 1960 the proportion was 7,5 per cent.

The proportion of Muslims was 16 per cent in 1921 and has remained at around 20 per cent since 1950. The proportion of Hindus has remained at 68 per cent since 1921 but it is likely that some Hindus were entered as "Buddhists" in the 1921 census and that the Hindu proportion is actually growing smaller.

—Africa Acts.

### THE END OF AN ERA

"I remember in May, 1948, the shock for many of us when the era of what could be called Smuts-English-speaking supremacy came to its end. Now 26 years later, the era of Nationalist Afrikaner supremacy is coming to its end too.

If we don't grasp that fact—if the Afrikaner Nationalists don't grasp it—our future, more so the White future than the Black, will be one of desolation. No one will escape.

From one point of view one can feel sympathy for the Nationalist. He suffered—even if not so much as he sometimes likes to think—for 100 years under British supremacy. I myself date the birth of Afrikaner Nationalism from 1806 when the British finally annexed the Cape.

#### Customs made into laws

His republics were never really free. Then in 1948 he suddenly became the lord of all and has been so for 26 years. But there won't be many more.

From another point of view one can feel no sympathy at all. He rode roughshod over all. All suffered under him, the English-speaking less than the others. He claimed to be maintaining the traditional way of life, but in fact he changed it radically. Customs had to be made into laws. And many of the laws were pitiless.

He claimed that one day the world would see the beauty of it all. But it hasn't turned out beautiful. The great prison edifice of apartheid, built at such a cost of time and money and devotion, is beginning to fall down. If anyone wants a proof, let him look at the Coloured Representative Council.

One must regard these events of 1974 as marking the end of one epoch and the beginning of another. In 1948 the opposition was stunned.

The more radical opposition was bludgeoned prostrate by the Suppression of Communism Act (1950), the Group Areas Act (1950), the Criminal Law Amendment Act (1952) and the Public Safety Act (1953). Now people are saying: What are we lying down for? Let's get up.

The truth is that a nation calling itself Christian cannot maintain apartheid with sustained conviction. Apartheid and the Christian gospel are incompatible. If Christians are enjoined to keep apart, it is from sin and the corruption of the world. But here in our country a Christian is kept apart from his brother. Worse still, a man—whether Christian or not—if often kept apart from his wife and children.

St. Paul wrote of a society in which there was neither Jew nor Greek, circumcision nor uncircumcision, Scythian nor Barbarian, bond nor free. What can that mean except what it does mean?

One must not suppose that the growing militancy of the Coloured people is quite unconnected with events in Portugal, Angola and Mozambique. Nor the exodus of potential guerilla fighters from South West Africa. Nor the epidemic of Black strikes." ...

"It has become almost a South African cliché to say that you can't fight enemies abroad if you have enemies at home. But it's true. R700 million for the borders won't satisfy aspirations and just aspirations—here at home.

We have been saying—for at least most of my life—that it's dangerous to hold down the lid of the boiling pot. But it's dangerous to take it off. There's only one way to lessen the danger, and that's to damp down the fire.

And how does one do that?

#### Narrow the salary gap

1. By narrowing the wage and salary gap, the aim being, at the very least, equal pay for equal work.
2. By making Black education, first free, and when possible, compulsory.
3. By giving Black labour, not only a legal but also an efficient means for presenting its just demands, in other words, trade unions.
4. By removing those humiliations which are destructive of human dignity.
5. By a more equitable sharing of political power, whatever the political structure of society may be.

#### A country to defend

There's a great deal of talk at the moment about the defence of the country. I shall choose only one comment. Chief Gatsha Buthelezi said in effect, of course we'll defend the country if you give us a country to defend."

—Alan Paton

—Sunday Tribune, 1.9.74.



*In view of the change of government in Portugal affecting Mozambique and Angola directly, and South Africa indirectly, a careful study of dictatorship, totalitarianism, true democracy and related subjects could at this stage be of more than academic value. The following review article on these themes is written by Mr. Charles Simkins who has an honours degree in philosophy, politics and economics as well as in physics. He is at present under contract to the government of Botswana and works as a planning officer in the Ministry of Mineral Resources and Water Affairs.*

# TOTALITARIANISM

charles simkins

**L. Schapiro: Totalitarianism— (Key Concepts in Political Science series)**

**Barrington Moore Jr: Social Origins of Dictatorship and Democracy.**

Critics of the policies of the South African government and of the behaviour of its agents, have from time to time said that they believe that South Africa threatens to become totalitarian, or that it is already so (at least in certain respects). A number of articles in recent issues of *Pro Veritate*, for instance, have contained explicit references to the rise of totalitarianism in this country.

To anyone who looks at contemporary South African society, adopting the perspectives of the main stream of classical and modern western political and social thought, it becomes clear that it is in a pathological condition. This is the more true if we adhere to the more exacting standards of Christianity. South African politics reflect this pathology most distinctly, but it also appears in human relationships not ordinarily thought of as political—witness Fugard's plays, for instance. The absence of significant civil rights and the repression of political opposition constitute a *prima facie* case for applying the label 'totalitarian' to our society.

But the case is weakened (or so it might seem) by contemporary critiques of the concept of totalitarianism. Many political philosophers deny that this term has much use in serious political analysis and some have claimed that its employment represents intent to mislead. Whether one ends up

agreeing with this school of thought or not, it seems to me desirable to review the arguments that have been advanced in an attempt to sharpen up our thinking about our situation. I shall attempt in this article only to introduce contemporary theories of totalitarianism: interested readers will be able to apply them to South Africa at least as well as I can.

## Characteristics of Totalitarianism

Unlike many of the concepts used in political discourse, the term 'totalitarian' originated neither in antiquity (like 'democracy', 'tyranny' etc.), nor at the beginning of the nineteenth century—which was a most productive period as far as the creation of new terminology was concerned—'socialism', 'individualism' and the like can be traced to this period: rather it took root in the English language in the 1930's. The term was coined to characterise three regimes: Hitler's Germany, Mussolini's Italy and Stalin's Soviet Union, with the possible addition of a fourth: Japan between about 1934 and 1945. The question arises: does this new term describe a new and unique form of political rule?

Professor Friedrich, in the mid-fifties, claimed that it did and he listed six aspects common to all totalitarian societies as follows:

- (i) an official ideology, to which everyone is supposed to adhere;
- (ii) a single mass party usually led by one man which has control over the state bureaucracy;

- (iii) a technically conditioned near-complete monopoly of control of the effective use of all weapons of armed combat;
- (iv) a near-complete monopoly exercised over all means of effective mass communications;
- (v) a system of physical or psychological terroristic police control;
- (vi) central direction and control of the entire economy.

Criticism of this 'six-point syndrome' has largely proceeded along the lines of demonstrating that all these features can be found in other (past or present) societies, and that therefore the syndrome does not serve to pick out a unique sort of political system. It is worth considering some of the criticisms in detail:

- (i) we should be on our guard against simple-minded conceptions of 'ideology' according to which only explicitly formulated and propagated systems of theories and symbols designed to guide political behaviour are considered as ideologies. Quite as ideological are implicit assumptions and attitudes instilled in members of a society from an early age onwards. Indeed, implicit assumptions and attitudes are likely to be more effective in determining behaviour, precisely because they are less visible and therefore less subject to criticism. Also, the existence of an explicit ideology propagated by the leaders and institutions of state may be indicative of conditions quite other than totalitarianism. For instance, it may be part of an attempt at escaping from a situation of poverty-stricken tribalism. Development ideology in many African countries could be viewed as an example of this.
- (ii) it is not demonstrated that the one-party state is necessarily totalitarian.
- (iii) monopoly of control over the means of violence over a given territorial expanse was taken to define a state in general and not just a totalitarian one by Max Weber; and surely he was right in supposing that effective control over weaponry is an essential element in the programme of every government intending to remain in power.
- (iv) central direction and control of the entire economy is, in some form or other, part of every socialist programme. It is tendentious in the extreme to argue that all socialism is totalitarian; on the contrary socialists argue that central direction of the economy is a condition of democracy in the crucially important field of the production and distribution of goods and services. Capitalism notoriously favours the few and oppresses the many in the distribution of wealth and income.

In the light of criticisms of this sort, Schapiro suggests that the fundamental defect in the six point syndrome is that it does not distinguish between means and ends—or, to put it another way, between the instruments of rule and the goals served by them. A given instrument of rule, to put it simply, can be used for either democratic or tyrannous ends: central control of the

economy would be a clear example of this.

Schapiro proposes the term 'contour' to characterise the significant features of the political aspects of a society and suggests that there are five contours by which a totalitarian regime can be recognised. The way in which these are related to each other can be seen by a brief examination of each:

- (i) *The Leader*: That the Leader played a paramount role in each of the three prototype totalitarian regimes of the 1930's and 40's is incontestable. But the important thing to realise is that the Leader cannot be regarded as merely the head of a party which has captured power within the state. Nor can his power be seen as flowing from the power of a strong state. On the contrary, once in power, the most successful totalitarian leaders acted to reduce the power of both party and state by setting them against each other and by setting factions within each against one another. The purpose of these manoeuvres was to ensure that the Leaders personally wielded supreme power, with no-one in a position to call them into account or to attempt their overthrow. The Leader's prime objective was therefore to see that no group could maintain any security or independent basis for existence.
  - (ii) *Subjugation of the legal order*: By 'legal order' as opposed to individual laws, Schapiro denotes an established system of rules, habits and institutions operating within a fixed framework of limits. The existence of legal order must always be some sort of a bulwark against free, unconstrained and arbitrary action by the Leader, for, as long as the legal order ensures that all existing laws are enforced until repealed or amended, some resistance remains to certain courses of action being taken by the Leader. Many of the laws in Hitler's Germany were undoubtedly evil, but it is nonetheless the case that the worst atrocities committed under his rule were illegal even in terms of these.
- This point becomes the stronger if the positivist 'command theory' of law is rejected. In terms of this theory, the state is the sole source of legal authority, provided only that its citizens continue to render it their effective allegiance. The competing account of law, which I believe to be a better account of actual legal practice in reasonably democratic countries and certainly a better outline of what is desirable, holds that concepts of fairness, 'natural justice' and human rights must be applied in interpreting statute and common law and these considerations should override it in extreme cases. If this view of law is taken, the authority of the legal order cannot be invoked in support of manifestly unjust actions of a Leader, no matter what formal procedures have been adopted.
- (iii) *Control over private morality*: One of the fundamental aims of the legal order is to maintain a minimum preserve within which the liberty of all citizens is protected from encroachment. The



ability of citizens to enforce their claims to freedom from interference may come into conflict, with the Leader's desired absolute freedom of action, or it may be merely a source of irritation to those who espouse a totalitarian ideology, one of whose most important features is a theoretical and practical lack of respect for the preferences and choices of individuals. Hence the impulse towards control over private morality. This can be seen to have reached an advanced stage when indoctrination, imparted through controlled education and news and information media, succeeds in making the subjects of a totalitarian state believe what the Leader wants them to believe.

- (iv) *Mobilisation*: Intensive and continuous mobilisation of the population characterised all three regimes. Shapiro points out that harrying of the population as a means of remaining in power has been a favourite device of tyrannous rulers since antiquity. Warmongering has three significant effects;
- (a) arousing the anxieties of the populace, driving them to support uncritically those who wield, or promote the illusion of wielding, the greatest amount of naked force;
  - (b) impoverishing subjects so as to keep them so busy earning a subsistence income that they have no time for political participation (thus Aristotle); and
  - (c) emphasising the practice of obedience and respect for authority rather than the responsible exercise of liberty in the daily life of the nation
- (v) *Mass legitimacy*: This is of a peculiar 'direct' kind which dispenses with intermediary institutions between the Leader and his people. Plebiscites and mass rallies were the favourite ways of eliciting support for the regime, without allowing participation in government in return. Genuine participation requires much more enduring institutions than these and is, of course, the last thing desired by a Leader.

If we look at totalitarianism in this way, it is clear that rationality becomes merely the rationale of preserving and extending the power of the Leader, no matter what the cost to everyone else. And the cost to everyone else is high, for totalitarianism necessarily has to create a condition of total insecurity and fear, which is truly horrible when fully developed.

### DICTATORSHIP AND ARBITRARY RULE

Schapiro discusses totalitarianism from the perspectives of political philosophy and science; Barrington Moore, on the other hand, applies sociological methods to historical material in his inquiry into the origins of dictatorship and democracy. Before discussing his ideas, it is necessary within the framework of this article to ask the question: How does his concept of 'dictatorship'



relate to what has already been said about totalitarianism?

Barrington Moore sees the development of democracy as an attempt to do three things:

- (i) to check arbitrary rulers;
- (ii) to replace arbitrary rules with just and rational ones;
- (iii) to obtain a share for the underlying population in the making of rules.

Dictatorship is taken to be the antithesis of democracy i.e. a state where the rules and rulers are arbitrary and participation in their making is extremely limited. Arbitrary rulers take in a wider group than that denoted by Schapiro's totalitarian leader. There can be the dictatorship of a narrow stratum or a class as well as individual dictatorship—Schapiro avoids a discussion

of totalitarianism in class terms (indeed, he suggests that class relations cease to play the determining role that they do in other regimes under totalitarianism), while Barrington Moore's analysis of the origins of dictatorship consists of an account of the differing ways that classes in a modernising society can relate to each other.

Part of the difference in approach can be ascribed to the fact that Barrington Moore is concerned with historical explanation while Schapiro's work is an exercise in conceptual analysis. But it is also the case that their subject matter is somewhat different: this could be reflected by drawing a distinction between totalitarianism and dictatorship, making the existence of a Leader a necessary condition of a totalitarian regime, while keeping the term dictatorship for a system of arbitrary rule without widespread participation. Is there is significant difference between totalitarianism and dictatorship as here defined? Perhaps not, for two reasons:

- (i) arbitrary rule by one man will differ in its surface characteristics from arbitrary rule by a stratum or a class in that political activity will be less focussed on the survival and strength of one man, political institutions will be headed by a more diverse group of people and political ideology will be less blatantly particular in whose aims it supports. However, the effects on the underlying population, excluded from power, will be much the same under both regimes;
- (ii) Barrington Moore discerns regularities in social history; from this basis, he develops his concepts and is led to group a series of experiences—whose determinants are similar—using the concept of 'dictatorship' and another series—whose determinants are also similar—using the concept 'democracy'. In other words, dictatorship turns out to be a useful concept in a causal analysis and is therefore a significant one, whereas conceptual analysis is generally stuck with the difficulty of having inadequate grounds for deciding what is and what is not significant.

Of course, many parallels can be seen in Schapiro's and Barrington Moore's respective treatments of totalitarianism and dictatorship. The existence of arbitrary rules and actions in a dictatorship corresponds roughly to Schapiro's 'subjugation of the legal order'. It is also implicit in Schapiro's analysis of the purpose and effects of continuous mobilisation, mass legitimacy and of the mode of operation of the Leader, that the underlying population has no real share in the political course of a totalitarian regime.

Now, the characteristic feature of modernising societies has been the growth of a bourgeoisie, the carrier of the introduction of industrial production and of the impetus towards urbanisation. Of course, the bourgeoisie has not developed in the same way in all societies; in some contexts their growth has been cut short by the abolition of private ownership of the means of production. Nonetheless, Barrington Moore sees dictatorship

or democracy as the political outcome of the various ways this class reacted with other classes in the course of its development. On the basis of the evidence he finds, he advances the thesis that a vigorous and independent class of town dwellers has been an indispensable element in the growth of parliamentary democracy.

Fascism is, of course, notoriously hostile to democracy. It stresses the values of hierarchy, discipline and obedience rather than the collective formulation of and adherence to just and rational rules. Its contempt for reasonable action is notorious; this contempt destroys the basis for independent evaluation of its commands and defiance of orders received if they do not meet minimum standards of justice.

### Dictatorship vs Democracy in South Africa

Dictatorship is the outcome of a certain type of past and fascism (which must interest more when seeking to apply all this to South Africa) a choice of a reactionary solution to inherited dilemmas about the distribution of power. An increasing preference for the dictatorial option characterises the white electorate's choices in contemporary South Africa. While it must be recognised that our history leaves us in a situation where morality and prudence often point in opposite directions and also that, whatever happens, democratic habits can only be instilled in the course of a long struggle, nearly all of which lies ahead of us, it might be well to point out the following:

- (i) the tendencies of dictatorial governments to cheat the groups that brought them into power should be noted. Both Stalinist communism and German fascism relied on mass support for their establishment; both dispensed with it for their continuance (for much less mass support is needed if a government in power follows policies of divide and rule, accompanied by mass intimidation). The original supporters of the regimes were allowed at most the illusion of participation in power;
- (ii) any argument to demonstrate that dictatorship is more efficient than democracy must founder on the historical facts. Overwhelming evidence has now been accumulated to demonstrate that there was endless chaos and muddle under Hitler, Mussolini and Stalin. Modern industrial society requires a good deal of creativity at most levels of its production process; dictatorship through the installation of fear, impairs creativity and therefore efficiency. We may not, therefore, support dictatorship *pro tempore* as a means of bringing a society into a state of affluence where democracy can be afforded. The fundamental pluralist intuition is that the best guarantee of liberty and order lies in the dispersion rather than the concentration of power in society; it is probably a recipe for effective economic development as well. ★



## NO CARD, NO JOB

*The South West Africa People's Organisation decides that the continued rejection of the card which offers 'Ovambo citizenship' is causing too much suffering.*

Leaders of the South West Africa People's Organisation—Swapo—in the Ovambo 'Homeland' in the north of South West Africa (Namibia) have told their followers that they may make use of Ovambo identification cards "when and if they so wish".

Their decision, they insist, is not a capitulation to the South African Government's separate development policy which set up the Ovambo homeland, but a realistic adjustment of Swapo policy in view of the suffering which the identification card issue was causing.

Ovambos, who make up 340 000 of Namibia's 745 000 people, were offered the chance to register for 'Ovambo citizenship' last year just before the elections for six seats in the new Ovambo Legislative Council. The card entitled its holder to vote.

Swapo has helped to lead the resistance of Namibians to the introduction of South Africa's homelands policy into Namibia, which splinters the country's black majority into political powerlessness. It has campaigned against the identification cards and against the Ovambo elections.

The latter campaign was so successful that less than three per cent of the eligible voters went to the poll, thus discrediting the South African Government assertion that the people of Namibia want the homeland system.

But the rejection of Ovambo identification cards makes life hard for the Ovambos. According to Swapo, people cannot get jobs in the southern part of S.W.A. (where many Ovambos work) or in Ovambo Government institutions if they have no card. They cannot get travelling documents, which are needed for journeys even within the country.

Teachers and nurses have been told that they will lose their salaries or even their jobs unless they register. People without cards have found that they could not withdraw their money from international banks. Students have been refused admission to education.

Farmers have been told that they will not be allowed to farm their own land unless they register. Sick people without cards have been denied medical treatment.

Swapo has now decided that, in order to "stand on the side of the suffering people", it will have to work out a new strategy over identification cards. After a long discussion, the Ovambo leaders of the organisation resolved "to allow those members who have thus far refused to betray their intelligence, conviction and human dignity, to avail themselves of those identification cards when and if they so wish".

At the same time the Swapo Executive promised its full support to those "who are determined to resist to the bitter end" and who would still refuse to get a card.

"This move should not be interpreted as a capitulation to the South African-imposed homeland policy, nor is it a relaxation of the struggle towards a free Namibia," says Swapo. It is, it seems, more of a necessary breathing-space for a people who have shown themselves prepared to suffer for their desire for national unity. ★

—Africa Acts



