



Registered at the GPO as
a newspaper

september
1974

PRO VERITATE

PRO VERITATE

CHRISTIAN MONTHLY
EDITOR: ROELF MEYER V.D.M.

15 SEPTEMBER 1974
VOLUME 13 NO. 5

CONTENTS

Editorial:	
HAMMANSKRAAL—THE THIRD WAY	1
Redaksioneel:	
HAMMANSKRAAL—DIE DERDE WEG	3
THE CHURCH AT THE CROSSROADS	5
THE ISSUES OF CONSCIENTIOUS OBJECTION	9
WHERE DO WE GO FROM HAMMANSKRAAL?	11
The root of the matter:	
"COUNTER-SUBVERSION"	15
IS CAESAR NOT GOD?	16
CONFORMERS OR MARTYRS?	17
LOOKING BACK ON LAUSANNE	18
WEIGHED AND ...?/GEWEEG EN ...?	21

FRONT COVER

BY COURTESY OF KATATURA:
NEWSLETTER OF NATIONAL
CATHOLIC FEDERATION OF
STUDENTS

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.

HAMMANSKRAAL - THE THE THIRD WAY

The reaction of the whites in general in the churches, the army, the government and in Parliament to the resolution taken at Hammanskraal by the South African Council of Churches in relation to the Gospel and conscientious objection shows not only a failure to comprehend the essence of the matter but also an unwillingness to take the gospel seriously as the final authority.

At the outset of our discussion of this matter the point must be made that as far as we are aware, apart from the communistic countries, South Africa is the only country which does not allow the performance of an alternative form of compulsory service in a non-military field. Normally the citizens of a free country may be exempted from compulsory military service on grounds of conscience or on grounds of strong moral or religious convictions.

Another aspect of this matter which claims our urgent attention is the fact that according to the gospel the government is not the highest authority in a country. The people and groups which allege that it is a duty imposed by the will of God to obey the government in this matter, and who rely on an interpretation of texts such as Romans 13: "Let every man be subject to the powers set over him ..." and Matthew 22: "Render therefore unto Caesar the things which are Caesar's ..." must be questioned in depth.

It may just be mentioned here that that to which the Christian must submit himself according to Romans 13 and that which belongs to Caesar must not be in conflict with the gospel. The authority of a government is in the sight of God always relative and limited and consequently the obedience which it demands must also be relative and limited. If it is accepted that a government exists in the service of God, then its service and its official authority are limited within God's will. It does *not* have final

authority in the political field as a demarcated sovereign authority of state. Revelations 13 conveys the warning that the government may *not* become a god in the political field. Therefore it is the duty of the Christian and the church as the light of the world to implement the gospel in the political field also since this is the measuring rod by which politics must be gauged—the gospel that is, and not one or other policy willed by man.

respect for authority

Here (or in any case where the authority of the government is called into question) it is not a matter of repudiation of government authority as such. It is precisely for reasons of respect for and obedience to authority, the highest authority, that Christians must reject false claims of government authority. It is precisely for reasons of regard for the authority of the government that Christians must reject such authority if it is in conflict with the gospel. This is the responsibility and the duty of the church, including also the army chaplaincies. Otherwise they are reduced to the status of a department of state carrying out the instructions of an earthly master.

If the government now proceeds with its proposed legislation which limits and debar the church from proclaiming the gospel message—such legislation as the bill to amend the Defence Act which will make it impossible for Christians and the church to dissuade people from taking part in military action or military training—such legislation would be totally unacceptable. Christians and the Church do not belong to the government or to its policy or to its will. They belong to Christ. The service, the sphere, the authority and the jurisdiction of the government are limited and demarcated. The gospel however covers the whole of life.

Furthermore, there may be no separation of the spheres of church and state, each with its own norms and independence such as the government and some men of the Church would have it.

As regards the external political order, Calvin closely defined the differentiation between church and state. He said that the task and the sphere of church and state differed in that the government must determine the political order, but Christians (the Church) must determine the norms for the political order according to the gospel. (Cf. "The gospel and politics according to Calvin", *Pro Veritate*, May 1974, pp. 16-20).

If the government is to prescribe what Christians and the Church may or may not proclaim including proclamations regarding military training and responsibility, then the government becomes subversive, revolutionary and extremely irresponsible as far as the Kingdom of God on earth is concerned.

As far as the question of violence and the defence of the country is concerned, it must be pointed out that the gospel grants to the government the right of resorting to the sword only against authentic criminal wrongdoing (and that again only in the context of Romans 13). A political system, however, built upon a foundation of compulsion and violence as starting point such as enforced 'separate development', instead of on a foundation of justice and freedom, cannot be imposed upon Christians in terms of God's righteousness; nor can they be compelled to defend such an un-Christian system with still more violence. The state's responsibility is this only—to establish justice and freedom, and to guarantee and defend them. If however the government embraces an ideology as its final political measuring rod, and expects Christians to defend this ideology by the use of weapons of violence, this ideology which is in conflict with the gospel, then the government itself is anti-Christian.

The authentic evil of the guerilla fighters on the borders of the country lies not in the fact that they wish to change the existing state of injustice in South Africa. According to its own statements the government itself wishes to change the situation in some respects. The authentic evil of the guerilla fighters and also of the government is that violence forms the basis of their policy and methods. Violence in the services of violence never solves the problem of further violence. It follows that the South African Council of Churches is correct in deploring the use of violence as a method of solving problems.

god's choice

It is also extremely dangerous to claim God's will and law to be on your side in an armed conflict.

Some claim God for the South African soldiers and allege that it is God's will that the country be defended by means of violence. Some claim God for the guerilla fighters and allege that it is God's will that South Africa be liberated from oppression by means of weapons. The conflict is also seen as a civil war since it is chiefly South Africans who have fled the country or who have been banned who are fighting against South Africans doing border duty.

Then on whose side is God? God is on the side of peace and justice. In this situation it means that society cannot be built upon the basis of an enforced ideology and that change also may not be brought about by violence.

Christians who on the strength of Romans 13: allege that a government has the right to take up the sword to punish the "evil-doer" who attacks a country and which does this by way of a 'righteous war' must also concede that the opposite may also be true. If a government is the 'evil-doer', then it must also be conceded that it can be punished by way of a 'righteous revolt'. This point of view is also supported historically by reformers such as Calvin. It was also more or less the point of departure of Bonhoeffer when he planned the overthrow of Hitler's regime.

The Cross shows us the way out of the dilemma. Christ died that we need no longer kill each other. The first way, that of institutionalised and military violence, and the second way, that of violence for the purpose of liberation, must make place for the third way, namely, that of *reconciling love!* We may not fight with violence for an enforced *co-existence of black and white*; nor may we fight for a compulsory *integrated existence*; but we must strive through radical peaceful action in the name of God for a *pro-existence* of people—people who live *for* each other and not apart from or against each other. To that end must the church *and* the government strive. ★

HAMMANSKRAAL - DIE DERDE WEG

Die blankes se reaksie oor die algemeen in die kerke, die leër, die regering en die parlement op die Hammanskraal-besluit van die Suid-Afrikaanse Raad van Kerke oor die evangelie en gewetensverset, toon nie net 'n onvermoë om die wese van die saak te begryp nie, maar 'n onwilligheid om erns met die evangelie as finale gesag te maak.

Aan die begin van die bespreking van die saak moet daarop gelet word dat Suid-Afrika sover bekend, feitlik die enigste land saam die Kommunistiese lande is wat nie toelaat dat alternatiewe diensplig op 'n nie-militêre terrein verrig word nie. Normaalweg word landsburgers in vrye lande die keuse op grond van hulle gewete, of op grond van sterk morele of godsdienstige oortuigings vrygelaat om nie militêre diensplig te doen nie.

'n Ander saak in dié verband wat dringend aandag moet geniet, is die feit vanuit die evangelie dat die regering nie die hoogste gesag in 'n land is nie. Die persone of groepe wat beweer dat dit die Godgewilde verpligting is om in dié opsig aan die regering gehoorsaam te wees en wat hulle op tekste soos Romeine 13 „Laat elke mens hom onderwerp aan die magte wat oor hom gestel is ...” en Mattheus 22 „Betaal dan aan die keiser wat die keiser toekom ...”, beroep, se interpretasie moet ten diepste bevraagteken word.

Hier kan slegs daarop gewys word dat dit waaraan die Christen hom volgens Romeine 13 moet onderwerp en dit wat die keiser toekom, nie met die evangelie in stryd moet wees nie. Die gesag van 'n regering is voor God se aangesig altyd relatief en beperk en gevolglik moet die gehoorsaamheid wat hy vereis ook relatief en beperk wees. As dit aanvaar word dat 'n regering in God se diens is, is sy diens en diensgesag beperk tot God se wil. Hy het *nie* finale gesag op die politieke terrein as afgebakende, soewereine staatsverant-

woordelikheid nie. Openbaring 13 bevat juis die waarskuwing dat die regering *nie* 'n god op politieke terrein mag word nie! Daarom is dit juis die taak van Christene en die kerk as die lig van die wêreld dat hulle ook die evangelie op die politieke terrein moet toepas aangesien dit die maatstaf vir die politiek is en nie een of ander beleid of mensewil nie.

eerbeid vir gesag

Dit gaan in elk geval hier, (of in enige geval waar die gesag van die regering ter sprake kom), nie om die verwerping van (regerings-)gesag as sodanig nie. Christene moet juis uit respek vir en gehoorsaamheid aan gesag, die hoogste gesag, valse aansprake van regeringsgesag verwerp. Christene moet juis uit eerbeid vir die regering van 'n land die regering se gesag, wat in stryd met die evangelie is, verwerp. Dit is die plig en verantwoordelikheid van die kerk, wat ook die kerk se kapelaanafdeling in die leër insluit, anders word hy gedegradeer tot 'n staatsdepartement wat die wil van sy aardse meester uitvoer.

As die regering met voorgestelde wetgewing kom wat die evangelie-boodskap van die kerk beperk en verhoed, soos die wysigingswetsontwerp oor verdediging wat dit onmoontlik wil maak vir Christene en die kerk om mense op grond van die evangelie af te raai om aan militêre aksie of opleiding deel te hê, is dit onaanvaarbaar. Die Christene en die kerk behoort nie aan die regering, of aan sy beleid of wil nie, maar aan Christus. Die regering se diens, terrein, outoriteit en jurisdiksie is beperk en afgebaken, terwyl die evangelie die ganse lewe dek.

Daar mag ook nie 'n skeiding van die terreine van kerk en staat, elkeen met sy eie norme en onafhanklikheid, gemaak word, soos die regering en sommige kerkleiers dit wil hê nie.

Wat die uiterlike politieke orde betref, het Calvyn die onderskeid tussen kerk en regering raak gedefinieer. Hy het gesê dat die taak en terrein van kerk en staat daarin verskil dat die regering die uiterlike politieke orde moet vasstel, maar die Christene (die kerk) moet die norme volgens die evangelie vir die politieke orde vasstel. (Vgl. „Die evangelie en die politiek volgens Calvyn”, *Pro Veritate*, Mei, 1974 p. 16-20).

As die regering vir die Christene en die kerk wil voorskryf wat hy mag en nie mag verkondig nie, ook met betrekking tot militêre opleiding en verantwoordelikheid, word die regering subversief, rewolusionêr, en uiters onverantwoordelik wat God se Koninkryk op aarde betref.

Wat die kwessie van geweld en die verdediging van die land betref, moet daarop gewys word dat die evangelie die regering alleenlik die diens en reg van die swaard, (en dit weereens alleenlik in die verband van Romeine 13), teen *outentieke kriminele kwaad* toeken. 'n Politieke sisteem wat egter op dwang en geweld as uitgangspunt en basis, soos geforseerde „afsonderlike ontwikkeling”, gebou word, in plaas van geregtigheid en vryheid, kan nie met Gods reg van Christene verwag, of hulle deur die wet dwing om so 'n on-Christelike sisteem met nog meer geweld te verdedig nie. Die staat se verantwoordelikheid is alleenlik dit, naamlik om vrede, geregtigheid en vryheid daar te stel, te waarborg en te verdedig. As die regering homself egter in diens van 'n ideologie as finale politieke maatstaf stel en van Christene verwag om dié ideologie, wat met die evangelie in stryd is, met die wapen te verdedig, word hy anti-Christelik.

Die outentieke kwaad van die guerilla-vegters op die grense van die land is nie dat hulle die situasie van onreg in Suid-Afrika wil verander nie. Selfs die regering wil volgens sy eie verklarings die situasie in sommige opsigte verander. Die outentieke „kwaad” van die guerilla-vegters sowel as dié van die regering is dat geweld die grondslag van hulle beleid en metode vorm. Geweld in diens van geweld los egter nooit ander geweld op nie. Daarom is die Suid-Afrikaanse Raad van Kerke korrek as hy geweld as 'n metode om probleme op te los, betreur.

God se keuse

Dit is ook uiters gevaarlik om God en sy wil en reg aan jou kant van 'n gewapende stryd op te eis. Sommige eis God vir die Suid-Afrikaanse soldate op en beweer dat dit God se wil is om die land met geweld in die situasie te verdedig. Sommige eis egter ook God vir die guerilla-vegters op en beweer dat dit God se wil is om Suid-Afrika van onderdrukking met die wapen te bevry. Die stryd word ook as 'n burgeroorlog gesien omdat dit hoof-

saaklik Suid-Afrikaners is wat die land uitgevlug het, of wat verban is, wat teen Suid-Afrikaners wat grensdiens doen, veg.

Aan wie se kant is God dan? God is aan die kant van vrede en geregtigheid. In dié situasie beteken dit dat die samelewing nie op 'n geforseerde ideologie gebou moet word nie, én dat verandering ook nie deur geweld bewerk moet word nie.

Die Christene wat op grond van Romeine 13 beweer dat 'n regering die reg het om die swaard op te neem om 'n „kwaaddoener”, wat 'n land aanval met 'n „regverdige oorlog” te straf, moet egter ook toegee dat die teenoorgestelde ook waar kan word. Indien 'n regering die „kwaaddoener” (Op. 13) word, moet ook toegegee word dat hy deur 'n „regverdige opstand” gestraf kan word. Hierdie sienswyse is dan ook deur Gereformeerders soos bv. Calvyn in die geskiedenis gehandhaaf. Dit was ook ongeveer die uitgangspunt van Bonhoeffer toe hy beplan het om Hitler se gesag omvêr te werp.

Die kruis wys vir ons die weg uit die dilemma aan. Christus het gesterf sodat ons mekaar nie meer hoef te dood nie. Die eerste weg, dié van institusionele en militêre geweld, en die tweede weg, dié van bevrydingsgeweld, moet plek maak vir die derde weg, nl. dié van versoeningsliefde. Ons mag nie met geweld veg vir 'n geforseerde *ko-eksistensie* van swart en wit nie, ook nie vir 'n gedwonge *integreerende eksistensie* nie, maar ons moet deur radikale vreedsame aksie in God se Naam arbeid vir 'n *pro-eksistensie* van mense—mense wat *vir* mekaar en nie teen of los van mekaar lewe nie! Daarvoor moet die kerk en die regering arbeid. ★



At the outset I would like to pay tribute to the President and members of the Executive Committee of the South African Council of Churches for their support during the year under review. The manner in which the Executive has addressed itself to the problems which are facing the Church is impressive. We are indeed, as a staff, grateful for their support. I would also like to pay tribute to each member of staff of the SACC and to publicly thank them for their hard work, dedication and sacrifice. I believe that a considerable amount has been achieved during the year under review and also that much has been left undone. We seem to be so good at identifying needs and yet somehow so slow in responding to them. This of course can cause frustration but has come to be accepted by those of us working in this context as inevitable.

The highlights of the year I would say were the establishment of the Revolving Development Fund of Inter Church Aid and the large programme of expansion undertaken there; the renewed and dynamic contacts with the African Independent Churches, and the launching of Theology by Extension; the appointment of a full-time Director of Mission and Evangelism; the creation of the newly structured Division of Communications; the creation of the Division of Women's Work; the possibilities of staging a Conference on Christian Literature; and the expressed interest on the part of numerous churches to become members of the SACC; and finally, the dialogue which is beginning to open with our brethren in the Dutch Reformed Churches after a break of some 34 years. Reports on all this will be reflected at the National Conference. We hope that you will share in moulding the future direction of programmes. We wish them all to be relevant to the life and work of the member Churches.

I have entitled my Report this year "THE CHURCH AT THE CROSSROADS" for I believe that this, at our stage in history, is where the Churches are. Never before in the history of South Africa have the eyes of so many been turned towards the Church in the seeking of a solution to the escalating problems confronting all population groups within South Africa. The Lusaka All Africa Conference of Churches Assembly experience was one which was not to be forgotten, and whilst it was controversial in many ways, spoke in a very clear sense to the future of all those living in the Southern part of Africa. There was no doubt that Apartheid in all its manifestations was rejected, and that the so-called concept of 'separate development' was not regarded seriously. In fact the support of this ideology in the light of current trends in the world was seen as one of divide and rule.

There is a story that takes place in America, that when the people living in the forest regions desire to know of the severity of the forthcoming winter, they go to one of the old Indian sages in the forest and ask him. It is thought that they have insight in this regard.

On one particular occasion an old Indian was approached and asked how the winter would be. He

JOHN REES

the church at the crossroads

The following address was delivered by Mr. John Rees, general secretary of the South African Council of Churches, at Hammanskraal on 31.7.74 as part of his report to the National Conference of Churches.

said, "Bad". When asked how he knew it would be bad, he said, "Why, the white man makes a big woodpile outside his house, and that is how I know." For so many commentators, and from speaking to the black group in South Africa, the future looks "Bad". How they know is that a fear-ridden white group is piling its arms high; is entrenching itself and hardening its attitudes—breaking the possibilities of dialogue.

No reconciliation without confrontation

Never before in the history of our country has the reality of possible violence been so close. It is not as though the black group desires violence, but in the many contacts that I have, they begin to see the possibility that violence will be inevitable; inevitable because of the intransigence of the white man; inevitable because the white man is not prepared to share; inevitable because the white man is too comfortable with what he has.

We in South Africa are deaf to the voices which come to us prophetically from all communities warning us of our impending spiritual and physical destruction. I believe that it is in the Church with Jesus Christ at its Head that there are still possibilities of reconciliation in this situation. These possibilities have been the reason why people have criticised the Church over the years and also have been extremely jealous of it, but for me it is also the point where the Church could either be the weakest or the strongest.

The words "reconciliation" and even "justice" today are bandied about to the extent that there is a danger that they could become meaningless. There is no reconciliation without confrontation; there is no true reconciliation without justice. Justice must be seen to be done. So often we in this country pay lip service to this.

How long do we think that those of us within the context of the Church can legitimately continue to react to organisations like the World Council of Churches whilst remaining silent and inactive on the home front, and doing nothing to redress the daily injustices in our human relations. One cannot but be dismayed by the callous and inhuman approach of many whites and blacks towards the whole problem of human relations in South Africa.

I was shocked recently after speaking to a very large Women's Group. I handed out a questionnaire in which the simple information required was: Name and surname of your domestic servant; is she married; does she have children; where do they stay; are the children at school; where does the husband work; does she have a Bible? I regret to say that the result in the context of that Christian Community was 95% of the people could not answer the questions beyond giving the Christian name. Small wonder that so many black Christians begin to despair of the possibility of there being any change. Whilst people continue to be regarded as labour units or pairs of hands with no personality, human dignity or feelings, we have no possibility of reconciliation.

For some time now people within the context of the

Church have been pleading for justice and reconciliation and have been mourning and pointing out the deterioration in human relations. They have done this against the background of a country which is slowly being whipped into a war psychosis. What has the Christian Church got to say about violence?

Recently a tragic event took place on the border of South Africa when a young white soldier was killed. I personally abhor this type of violence, but I equally abhor the news that came a few days later that the persons who were supposed to have killed him were tracked down and four were killed. What a terrible waste of young life on both sides. I believe that the Church should mourn with both sides, but should go much further in saying "Why, why this terrible waste of young life? Is there no other way to solve this problem?" We seem to be good at identifying problems but nobody is bold enough to work on the answers.

This reminds me of a story recently related to me by an African friend who said that as a child he remembered very clearly watching a mamba follow a frog. At first the frog was able to jump away, but the snake persistently followed till the stage was reached where the frog was so petrified that it was unable to move. Its small brain was telling its legs to move, and visible were the reflexes in the muscles, but it did not move. All it did was jump up and down on exactly the same spot, until the snake was able to come and overtake it.

I believe that this is the situation that we have reached, not only within the Church in South Africa, but within the country itself. We go through the motions, we make statements, we do things, but we do not move. We are trapped by our very history. We are prisoners of what we have perpetrated and allowed to be perpetrated over such a long period.

What we need is bold and courageous leadership to take us out of this situation. People who have called for this have been accused of 'crying wolf'. People who have demanded this within the life of the country and within the Churches have in some instances become outcasts. Yet the fact remains that a vision of what the Church could be and should be was theirs.

This brings me to the point where I heard the story of a person who went down to the seaside to watch the waves breaking. As many of you will know, at a given moment as the wave curls over, there is a beauty and translucence which can never be forgotten, but at that same instant that person saw two sharks reflected in the wave.

I believe that this is the situation that within the seeming beauty and tranquility of the situation, people have seen sharks lurking and have issued warning. Because others do not see the sharks, it does not mean that they are not there. In fact it means that they are there and that the danger exists—a warning has been sounded.

We are caught in the situation of relying on our own human capacity. Everyone in South Africa seems to be

turning to the other in seeking some sort of leadership to take us out of the situation.

On a recent trip to America, in one of the country districts, I can remember walking through the snow as it was falling, and recognising that the sky was dark and that the snow was light. Yet this is in fact an illusion because it was the sky which illuminated the snow. It appeared as though I was walking through light whilst there was darkness above.

It came to my mind that the "illuminated" can never be brighter than the "Illuminator". In much of what we say and do in this country we have put our wills, our ideologies, above that of the Lord of Life, even Jesus Christ. We think that we shine greater—we claim that we have ways of life that must be kept and copied. We claim to have peace in the midst of a troubled world, yet in the context of the world we are like sounding brass. Most white South Africans are blissfully unaware of the deep disturbances and unrest within, the hearts and lives of black people. The very fact that they continue to be able to say "see how happy black people are" against the background of their poverty and discontent, shows this.

Geneva and Lausanne

For some time now the debate has raged in this country around the action of the World Council of Churches. I think it is known that I have clearly spoken for our continued involvement in that world body and I believe that in the integrity of our witness in the context of that organisation we have been listened to by many of our fellow Christians around the world, to the extent that the majority of Churches in the world are now sympathetic to the stand and witness of the Churches in South Africa.

The Programme to Combat Racism which over and above its many and other varied programmes has placed the WCC in the limelight, is one which I believe all churches should support. Racism in all its dimensions should be eradicated, particularly from the point of view of the Gospel in that it is alien to the Christian way of life. It is however this Programme which I believe unfortunately was given a negative name in the beginning, which has created a tremendous amount of controversy.

One can either draw the conclusion that the reaction to the Programme has resulted because racism has penetrated the very life of the Church, or perhaps it could be said that the programme which set out to combat racism has become a 'programme to promote racism'. I believe with all my heart that the World Council of Churches needs to take heed of what is being said in this area by those who are demanding that in a world involved in many complex social issues, the supremacy of Christ be proclaimed always.

We need to take heed of a warning in this particular area that the total identification of the Church with any political movement can be extremely dangerous. This is my worry in regard to the world churches' total identification with the liberation movements. We should be

aware that exactly the same principle applies in this instance as has been used by the same Christian body in relation to criticism of our brethren in the Dutch Reformed Church and their relationship to the Nationalist Party in South Africa. One thing that we must be is consistent in our basic principle of criticism.

At the same time we have heard recently of the crisis at Lausanne. What a tragedy that this should be seen as an opposition to the World Council of Churches. Herein lies, I believe, the ailment of Western theology that we have tended to dichotomise the Gospel into so-called 'evangelicals' and so-called 'social activists'. This division is not known in the Third World. We have the privilege in this country of being able to sit and listen to those for whom this is no problem, in our own black community. The concept that the Church should only be involved in the saving of souls and that all is well when this has been achieved is wrong. We must strive against this in the life of our Church.

Some people mistakenly believe that if we had to resign from the World Council of Churches then the problem on our border could be solved. How much can they delude themselves, and what would this ceremonial washing of hands achieve? Likewise some people believe that if we only preach the Gospel and do not become involved in so-called "politics" then all will come out all right. How can they delude themselves? Have they not read Church History?

What we need at this time is *New Men for Our Times*. Elton Trueblood has pointed to the new man for our time; a man who is deeply convinced evangelically and committed to his fellow man. Yes, this type of person is required within the context of our Church: A person who stands firm on both those pillars. This new man for our time must be capable of dreaming the impossible dream,—dreaming what South Africa could be and must be. We need as many positive dreamers as possible.

I believe the time has come for the Church to call boldly for new men for our time—men deeply committed to Jesus Christ, and equally deeply committed to the social issues of our time, men who are new men for our time, men who are committed to dreaming the impossible dream that South Africa can live together peacefully and be reconciled, despite the gathering forces.

It is against this background that I also wish to state that I do not believe that, as a result of our history over a long period, suddenly our black brethren have become angels overnight. Far from it. They stand in as great a need of salvation as any other group within our land. I believe that there must be a willingness for co-operation and for striving for reconciliation from their part, as with any other group. I also believe that the dawning of a new era of insight in telling white people exactly where they stand, and stepping down from what I understand is a situation which has grown up over the years of giving the answers that they think white people want to hear; also a commitment on their part to speaking their mind boldly, especially within the context of the Church.

I believe that the time has come for the Church to be bold. The Council has persistently proclaimed that it stands for justice and reconciliation and I believe that we must do so, and that we must do so boldly. What we need is a massive public relations campaign in South Africa, with a budget equivalent of the Defence Budget, to help us avert a catastrophe which lurks in the whole field of human relations. The rank paternalism, the continuing Father Christmas attitude which exists in both the church and in the very structure and fabric of this country is sickening in the extreme to the black man who is reaching the place where he cannot tolerate it any longer. Do we blame him if there is an air of anticipation and excitement at what appears to be happening north of us? The meaningless reiteration of the fact that people in this country live better lives, are better educated, reveals a pathetic misunderstanding of the quality of human life, when people in fact want to be free.

Yes, one realises that there are problems around what freedom means. One of John Wesley's hymns says, "Make me a captive and then I shall be free." I believe that it is as the Church begins to spell out what true liberation means—being caught up by Jesus Christ as Lord and Saviour, being caught up in new relationships, that there is a possibility of hope. Everybody seems to fall into a trap of setting time scales—"How much longer have we got?" That is now irrelevant. I think we should operate from the basis that we have no more time!

Priorities

It is against this background that I wish to make humbly as an individual, some proposals, which I believe will help in part to avert what I can only see as a coming calamity. We cannot continue to trade on the goodwill of Blacks which has come to us and been our part for such a long time. There must be radical change, urgent and fast. I believe that there can only be this sort of change if we look at the following things:

1. *A sharing of power*, political power, on the basis of parity of representation in the Houses of Parliament, granting at this stage representation in the highest policy-making body of this country of equal representation to black and white.
2. The Abolition of job reservation.
3. The Abolition of the Immorality Act.
4. Recognition of Trade Unions.
5. The Abolition of the Migratory Labour System and the recognition of rights of black people to remain in urban areas, and for an immediate crash programme of housing to be embarked upon.
6. For a curtailment and abolition of the Influx Control Regulations which have reaped so much havoc in the lives of black people.
7. For immediate embarkation, in consultation with all black leaders, on a crash programme for compulsory and free education.

8. Equal pay for equal work.

These are the things which I believe we as a Church must proclaim and work for as the practical path to reconciliation, alongside that much needed and all important proclamation of Jesus Christ as Lord and Saviour; of Jesus Christ as the pattern for reconciliation; of Jesus Christ as the pattern maker of justice; of Jesus Christ as the final arbiter in respect of justice.

I believe that the Church must also proclaim judgment and sanctification. We cannot continue to allow people to delude themselves about living happily in this situation without declaring the judgment of God and the call for sanctification in all our ways.

Gatsha Buthelezi has said that there is no military solution to the problems of South Africa. I could not agree with him more. Violence has never achieved anything. We continue to boast about our uranium and gold resources, yet somehow we forget that people are living here, and that tragedy is being wrought daily in the lives of many by enforced removals, by separation of families. My heart bleeds for white people who have never known meaningful contact with black people as friends. Their lives are impoverished as a result of this enforced separation to which we have been subjected.

This claim on the part of our Afrikaner brethren that they are a "volk" apart cannot be accepted. One wonders where the origin of their fear is. Bearing in mind that if they are worried about their identity as a minority group, one only has to remind them that Indians have existed as a minority group in this country for a long time and have not lost their cultural heritage. I think it goes deeper than this. When cultural identity is linked with power it is ultimately the power which is the corrupting thing. The Church has a word here, has a word for all of us whether black or white, that we must rise above this, that we must see one another as human beings, that we must be prepared to work and live together.

Finally, I believe that unless Churches take seriously the question of reconciliation and liberation above all else on their packed agenda of annual meetings, above all else in the erection of buildings and the payment and repayment of loans and debts, the judgment of God and of history will be upon us, that in the Church's finest hour Christians were found wanting.

Where do we go from here? How many are prepared to make a bold stand? Will it be easier for both sides for one to wait for its liberation and the other to resort to clichés and power? I believe the choice is "Violence, or Jesus Christ!"★

theo kotze

THE ISSUES OF CONSCIENTIOUS OBJECTION

In all the hypocritical hoo-haa about the SACC Hammanskraal statement, some of the very important issues have been completely lost. I therefore want to spell out as clearly as possible what I understand to be the central issues facing us all.

1. Violence

It is clear that all of us in South Africa are already living in a situation of violence. There is violence on our borders, there is violence within the country. Whites readily accept the former fact but the majority reject the latter fact even though this is the daily experience of blacks within the country.

2. Reaction to Violence

Violence (i.e. Counter Violence) or Non-Violence.

(N.B. This is obviously not only a Christian issue but I am writing in the context of a decision by the S.A. Council of Churches and will therefore consider this from what I understand to be a Christian point of view).

There are two basic Christian traditions:

(a) No violence under any circumstances.

There is no doubt that Jesus condemned the perpetuation of violence, even in self-defence.

The old law of "an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth" was superseded by the law of love. Jesus said "Love your enemies, bless those that curse you, do good to them that despitefully use you and persecute you" ...

If a man wrong you, you must not wrong him in return ... "If he hits you on the cheek, offer him the other cheek".

(b) In other circumstances, Jesus could be angry, but He never advocated killing nor did He kill. He overturned the tables of the money changers in the temple who were guilty of covert violence and chased them out. A famous Scottish biblical scholar has helped me here. In an exposition of "Blessed are the meek", William Barclay explains this by saying that Jesus was always angry at the right time, when wrong was being done to others but never angry at the wrong time—that is when wrong or violence was done to himself.

Therefore, the problem that arises is whether one can allow the wrong done to others (which may be overt or covert violence) to continue without intervention. It is just here that, throughout the centuries, Christians have been divided. They have opted for either *the Just War* or for *Conscientious Objection*.

An objective consideration of the SACC Hammanskraal statement shows that the SACC *leaves that option open*.

The Just War

The criterion is whether the cause involved is a fight for *justice*, whether this is a defence of a just society or the liberation of those suffering injustice.

The 1939-1945 war is a case in point. On the one side there were those who believed they were waging a just war against the horrors being perpetrated in Germany. Their purpose was not only to liberate the Jews but also the German people from the system that had engulfed them and was in danger of engulfing the world. On the other side there were those who were fighting a just war in defence of their country. For many this meant "my country right or wrong". But is this not national idolatry? Can a Christian defend that which is morally wrong? For God's sake? In South Africa now, this becomes a very crucial issue and must be based on the question "Who are citizens of South Africa?", which must surely lead to the answer "All who have full rights as citizens".

This, then, is the basic question that confronts white South Africans. In the face of this the SACC conference:

1. Maintains that Christians are called to strive for justice and the true peace which can be founded only on justice.
2. Points out that the theological definition of a "just war" excludes war in defence of a basically unjust and discriminatory society.
3. Points out that the Republic of South Africa is at present a fundamentally unjust and discriminatory society and that this injustice and discrimination constitutes the primary, institutionalised violence which has provoked the counter-violence of the terrorists or freedom fighters.
4. Points out further that the injustice and oppression under which the black peoples of South Africa labour is far worse than that against which Afrikaners waged their First and Second Wars of Independence and that if we have justified the Afrikaners' resort to violence (or the violence of the imperialism of the English) or claimed that God was on their side, it is hypocritical to deny that the same applies to the black people in their struggle today.

Justice

There is a great passage in the book of the prophet Micah "All that the Lord requires of you is to do justly and to love mercy and to walk humbly with your God." The implication is that justice includes mercy and humility on the part of those implementing justice. The Bible amplifies this "Do unto others as you would have them do unto you". This means the application of certain standards and values. The Oxford dictionary defines justice as "just conduct; fairness; exercise of authority in maintenance of right; to do justice to; to treat fairly; to show your appreciation of".

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

Civil War

A statement from the Johannesburg office of the Christian Institute makes it clear that the situation in which we find ourselves is a civil war. "The basic misunderstanding in all white reaction thus far is that the war on the borders of South Africa is a war against foreign aggression, an attack from "outside", whereas blacks see this basically as a civil war ... South Africans who have fled from the country are in a major sense responsible for the conflict. The conflict is between South Africans and South Africans, brother against brother ... Critics who do not take this into account will not be able to judge on merit the SACC decision at Hammanskraal, where there was approximately a two-thirds black majority" (*Die Burger* 7.8.1974).

Patriotism

The Oxford dictionary defines a patriot as "One who defends or is zealous for his country's freedom or rights". This brings us back to the question as to who are the citizens of South Africa. Perhaps the most significant statement yet made in the context of citizenship or patriotism is that of David Curry, deputy leader of the Labour Party "I cannot offer white South Africa my loyalty. I cannot offer the blood of my child on the border because when he dies he is a South African but when he lives he is a Coloured". (*Cape Times*, 10.7.1974).

Conscientious Objection

The SACC conference ...

"Calls on its member Churches to challenge all their members to consider in view of the above whether Christ's call to take up the Cross and follow Him in identifying with the oppressed does not, in our situation, involve becoming conscientious objectors."

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 for peace but in a peaceful way, that you are willing to combat evil but in a non-violent way". "It is better if the will of God be so, that ye suffer for well-doing than for evil-doing" (1 Peter 3.17).

The Religious Society of Friends have for many years struggled with this dilemma and I can do no better than quote from their 1950 statement:

"By fighting for civilization and precious lives we may not save but destroy them, and would most probably destroy all moral and spiritual standards of our world through the use of the weapons of mass-destruction. And on the other hand refusal to fight need not be surrender. Nevertheless nothing can be harder than that choice".

Hence Friends have repeatedly reaffirmed the statement made originally in 1661 by its founder George Fox and Richard Hubberthorne on behalf of the Society.

"We utterly deny all outward wars and strife and fightings with outward weapons, for any end or under any pretence whatsoever. And this is our testimony to the whole world. The spirit of Christ, by which we are guided, is not changeable, so as once to command us from a thing as evil and again to move unto it; and we do certainly know, and so testify to the world, that the spirit of Christ, which leads us into all truth, will never move us to fight and war against any man with outward weapons, neither for the Kingdom of Christ, nor the kingdoms of this world." ★

WHERE DO WE GO FROM HAMMANSKRAAL?

james moulder

The South African Council of Churches

- deplores violence as a means to solve problems
- calls on its member churches to challenge all their members to consider ... whether Christ's call to take up the cross and follow him in identifying with the oppressed does not, in our situation, involve becoming conscientious objectors.
- prays for the Government and people of our land and urgently calls on them to make rapid peaceful changes in our society so that the violence and war to which our social, economic and political policies are leading us may be avoided.

These extracts from the S.A.C.C.'s resolution on conscientious objection caused a considerable storm. Now that the dust has started to settle I want to try to discover what the resolution is all about; and to begin to explore what some of its implications are. And because my understanding of the resolution and its implications has, probably, been clouded by the controversy which has surrounded the whole affair, I simply want to discuss some questions which are raised by the words which I have quoted from the resolution.

What is conscientious objection?

In general, a conscientious objector is someone who is opposed to the use of war as a means towards the solution of political problems. Some conscientious objectors refuse to submit to any kind of military training and service. Others, however, simply refuse to submit to combat training and service; they are, for example, prepared to serve in a medical or civil defence corps. Consequently, those who support the S.A.C.C.'s call to its member churches need to specify which kind of conscientious objection they want people to consider. And this clarification is necessary because, under South African law, it affects the legality or otherwise of someone's decision to become a conscientious objector.

Is conscientious objection illegal?

The Defence Force Act exempts, amongst others, a 'minister of religion of a prescribed denomination' from being called up for military service 'in time of war, internal disorder or other emergency' (subsection (1) (d) of Section 97). It also stipulates that:

Any person who *bona fide* belongs and adheres to a recognized religious denomination, by the tenets whereof its members may not participate in war, may be granted exemption from serving in any combatant capacity, but shall, if called upon to do so, serve in a non-combatant capacity. (subsection (3) of Section 97).

I mention these provisions of the Defence Force Act for two reasons. On the one hand, anyone who belongs to and adheres to a denomination which has always emphasised objections to military service may decide to become a conscientious objector without doing anything illegal; provided, of course, that he is prepared, if called upon to do so, to serve in a non-combatant capacity. As far as I know, however, the Society of Friends is the only member of the S.A.C.C. to whom this section of the Defence Force Act applies; none of the other denominations have ever emphasised objections to military service.

The other reason I have mentioned these provisions of the Defence Force Act is that it exempts the clergy of the S.A.C.C.'s member churches from being called up for military service. In other words: the clergy of these denominations will never be given the opportunity to become conscientious objectors because they will never be called upon to do military service in time of war, internal disorder or other emergency. The Defence Force Act therefore, carries a very serious implication for the S.A.C.C.'s resolution; the authority structures of the S.A.C.C.'s member churches being what they are, it is only the clergy of these denominations who can effectively challenge their members to consider whether or not Christ's call requires them to become conscientious objectors. But the clergy themselves are exempted from being able to respond to this challenge. Consequently, it is reasonable to suppose that most clergy will not challenge the members of congregation to consider conscientious objection; and reasonably so. And this supposition is reasonable even if one takes into account the fact that asking people to consider conscientious objection may be illegal in terms of other sections of the Defence Force Act.

If, therefore, we reflect on the S.A.C.C.'s resolution in the light of the Defence Force Act, the position seems to be as follows:

- The clergy of the S.A.C.C.'s member churches cannot, with a good conscience, implement that section of the resolution which calls upon Christians to consider conscientious objection.
- The Defence Force Act allows Christians who belong and adhere to denominations which have always emphasised objections to military service to become conscientious objectors; provided, of course, that they are prepared, if called upon to do so, to serve in a non-combatant capacity.
- On the other hand, for anyone who is not covered by subsection (3) of Section 97 of the Defence Force Act, conscientious objection is illegal.

I have mentioned all this because, at a later stage of these reflections, I want to consider who, if anyone, is threatened by the S.A.C.C.'s resolution.

Who passed the resolution?

This question and the next is also relevant to a consideration of who is threatened by the S.A.C.C.'s resolution. Briefly, the resolution was passed by the official representatives of the S.A.C.C.'s member churches, and they were unanimous in voting for it. But this brief answer to the question obscures the fact that, of the 10 million Christians in fellowship with the S.A.C.C., 85 per cent are 'black'. And so, although the resolution was proposed by two 'whites', it was passed by a group of people the majority of whom are 'black'; and so on behalf of a group of people the majority of whom are 'black'.

Who are being asked to consider conscientious objection?

Once again a brief answer to this question is not the most significant one. Although the resolution calls on the member churches 'to challenge all their members' to consider conscientious objection, the fact that 85 per cent of the 10 million Christians who are in fellowship with the S.A.C.C. are 'black' means that more 'black' Christians than 'white' ones are being asked to consider whether or not Christ requires them to become conscientious objectors. More specifically, more 'black' Christians than 'white' ones are being asked to consider whether they should refuse to submit to combat training and service either in the Defence Force or in militant opposition movements like SWAPO.

Who is threatened by the resolution?

If the member churches of the S.A.C.C. do challenge all their members to consider conscientious objection; and if many of their members do decide to become conscientious objectors, then who will be affected by their decision?

The Defence Force will obviously be affected if many of the 10 million Christians who are in fellowship with the S.A.C.C. decide to become conscientious objectors. And if large numbers of 'black' and 'white' Christians

who belong to those churches who are members of the S.A.C.C. refuse to submit to combat training and service, then this will make it very difficult for South Africa to defend herself. And it will be difficult for her to defend herself, not only against the militant opposition movements who operate on her borders, but against any foreign power with whom she may become embroiled. Consequently, anyone who urges people to consider conscientious objection is threatening the efficiency of the Defence Force, and, therefore, of the country's ability to defend herself.

On the other hand, anyone who urges the 10 million Christians who are in fellowship with the S.A.C.C. to consider conscientious objection is also threatening the military efficiency of militant opposition movements, like SWAPO, whose members are 'black' South Africans. And there are two reasons why a movement like SWAPO is threatened by the S.A.C.C.'s resolution.

In the first place, anyone who becomes a conscientious objector must refuse to submit to combat training either in the Defence Force or in a movement like SWAPO. But since 85 per cent of the 10 million Christians to whom the S.A.C.C.'s resolution is directed are 'black', militant opposition movements are, perhaps, more threatened by this resolution than South Africa as a whole.

The other reason why movements which are in militant opposition to South Africa are threatened by the S.A.C.C.'s resolution, is that some of the leaders of these movements claim that most of their members are Christians. These claims were made at the All Africa Conference of Churches held in Lusaka in May, 1974, (*Pro Veritate* (June, 1974) pp. 14-15). And in an interview with the editor of *Pro Veritate*, Andreas Shipanga of SWAPO claimed that 90 per cent of all their members and soldiers are Christian. (*Pro Veritate*, (July, 1974) pp. 6-9). If, therefore, the members of SWAPO belong to denominations which are represented by the S.A.C.C.; and if these denominations do challenge all their members to consider conscientious objection, then recruitment to, and the military efficiency of, SWAPO will be threatened.

These reflections, however, seem to be somewhat unreal. In fact, I tend to agree with the Prime Minister's opinion that the S.A.C.C.'s resolution will fall on deaf ears. Consequently, I do not suspect that either the Defence Force or a militant opposition movement like SWAPO will be affected by the S.A.C.C.'s resolution. But even if my reflections on who are threatened by the resolution are unreal, they are not without value. They do suggest that all those who have supported the S.A.C.C.'s resolution deplore the use of war both as a means of maintaining, and as a means of changing, the economic, political and social structures of our society. And this suggests that all those who have supported the S.A.C.C.'s resolution are not prepared to condone either the activities of the militant movements which operate on the borders of South Africa or the use of the Defence Force to maintain order and stability in this

part of the world.

More specifically, my reflections on who are threatened by the S.A.C.C.'s resolution suggest that it contains at least two consequences for all those who support it. On the one hand, those who support the resolution have indicated that, even if they can understand why some opponents of the economic, political and social structures of our society have decided to employ guerilla warfare as a means towards their political ends, they are not prepared to condone either this decision or the activities which flow from it. And this unwillingness to condone guerilla warfare as a means towards the attainment of political ends is a positive contribution by Christians, and those who support Christian values, to discussions about the legitimacy or otherwise of violence and war.

On the other hand, and by the same token, those who support the S.A.C.C.'s resolution have indicated that, even if they can understand why a government is prepared to use its defence force in a guerilla-type civil war, they are not prepared to condone this way of maintaining order and stability in our society. And this unwillingness to condone the use of the Defence Force to maintain order and stability in our society means that those who support the S.A.C.C.'s resolution agree with all those churchmen, economists, educationalists, newspaper editors, politicians, sociologists and soldiers that guerilla warfare cannot be combated simply by military means; that what is required is a willingness to devise and implement economic, political and social policies which makes people want to preserve, and not to destroy, their society.

How does the resolution affect the churches?

I have argued that, if the churches who belong to the S.A.C.C. decide to implement this resolution, the recruitment to and efficiency of both the Defence Force and militant opposition movements like SWAPO will be weakened. But I have maintained that this threat to the Defence Force and the militant opposition movements is somewhat unreal. And it is unreal because there is no reason to believe that the majority, if any, of the S.A.C.C.'s member churches will decide to call upon all its members to consider conscientious objection. And there is even less reason to believe that, if this resolution is implemented, many South Africans will decide to become conscientious objectors. If these suppositions of mine are correct, then what are the consequences for the S.A.C.C. and its member churches?

It is easier to ask this question than to answer it; but there are at least two areas of the churches' existence which seem to be threatened by the response there has been, and is likely to be, to this resolution; namely, their authority and their understanding of their place and task in our society. I want to maintain, therefore that even though neither the Defence Force nor the militant opposition movements are threatened by the S.A.C.C.'s resolution, its member churches need to face the consequences of the way in which it was received.

In the first place, it is now more obvious than it was before that *ecclesiastical pronouncements on our economic, political and social problems carry no weight and do not change our attitudes to, and understanding of, these problems*. I say this because of the way in which the S.A.C.C.'s resolution was rejected by politicians and the mass media; and because of the large number of people I have encountered who did not even know about the resolution or about the storm which it caused!

In other words: many people failed to hear what the churches had to say; and those who did hear, and who have the means to influence public opinion, rejected the resolution. Consequently, *it is now more obvious than it was before that the churches no longer have the authority, influence and power which they once had in our society*. And, if this is so, it is no longer clear what we are talking about when we employ such phrases as 'the prophetic ministry of the Church' and 'challenging the members of our society.' And it is no longer clear what we are talking about when we use these phrases because they suggest that ours is a theocratic society; or, more guardedly, that the churches are an effective part of the decision-making and opinion-forming centres of our society.

But if I am correct in suspecting that ecclesiastical pronouncements no longer carry any weight in our society, then it becomes necessary to ask ourselves what our place and our task is in South Africa. And I want to suggest that we need to give much more attention than we have to the *concept of a servant church*; and much less attention to the *concept of a prophetic church*. After all, it was Jesus who chose to call himself and his followers servants. And we all know how much authority, influence and power servants have in our society!

I have, of course, failed to provide exhaustive answers to the questions which have been raised by the S.A.C.C.'s resolution. All I have done is to record some of the thoughts which come to mind when one begins to reflect on them. But I hope that we will not ignore these questions; and that, amongst other things, we will try to understand what Bonhoeffer was after when he wrote these words:

"The Church is her true self only when she exists for humanity. As a fresh start she should give away all her endowments to the poor and needy. The clergy should live solely on the freewill offerings of their congregation, or possibly engage in some secular calling. She must take her part in the social life of the world, not lording it over men, but helping and serving them. She must tell men, whatever their calling, what it means to live in Christ, to exist for others. And in particular, our own Church will have to take a strong line with the blasphemies of *hybris*, power-worship, envy and humbug, for these are the roots of evil. She will have to speak of moderation, purity, confidence, loyalty, steadfastness, patience, discipline, humility, content and modesty. She must not underestimate the importance of human example, which has its origin in the humanity of

Jesus, and is so important in the teaching of St. Paul. It is not abstract argument, but concrete example which gives her word emphasis and power." (*Letters and Papers from Prison*. (Fontana, 1959) page 166).

Where can we go from Hammanskraal?

I have tried to reflect on some of the implications of the S.A.C.C.'s resolution. And I have argued for two claims.

On the one hand, I have maintained that neither the Defence Force nor the militant opposition movements like SWAPO are threatened by the resolution. On the other hand, I have suggested that even if no one else is threatened by the resolution, the S.A.C.C. and its member churches are. I therefore want to conclude with a question I would rather avoid: where can we go from Hammanskraal? And I would prefer to avoid this question because, quite frankly, I don't know. But perhaps it will help others to explore this question if I make an observation and a suggestion.

The Spro-cas programmes which were initiated and supported by the S.A.C.C. and the Christian Institute discovered that the most significant fact about our society is not that some of us are more or less white and some of us more or less black. If that sounds absurd and unlikely, may I suggest you try the following thought experiment: imagine that, when you wake up tomorrow, you discover that nothing has changed in South Africa except that everybody is now the same colour as you are and speaks the same language as you do! Now ask yourself what, if anything, you would want to change in our society; how you would set about it; who, if anyone, would be opposed to your proposals; and why.

I will not attempt to influence or to anticipate the results of anyone's imagination or of anyone's attempts to answer these questions. I simply want to recommend the experiment. And I want to claim that anyone who tries it will soon begin to discover why, amongst other things, various Spro-cas reports stressed the desirability of a substantial improvement in the economic position of 'blacks'. But I want to go further than this. I want to ask each of the S.A.C.C.'s member churches to consider what Jesus' parable about Dives and Lazarus requires them to do; and whether it does not, perhaps, require them to do something like making an annual contribution of 10 per cent of their income and 1 per cent of the value of their assets towards 'black' educational and economic development schemes?

I ask this question because the last paragraph of the S.A.C.C.'s resolution is as much of a challenge to the churches as it is to the Government and the other people and institution of our land. This is because it:

prays for the Government and people of our land and *urgently calls on them to make rapid, peaceful changes in our society* so that the violence and war to which our social, *economic* and political policies are leading us may be avoided.

But are these reflections on how the churches are threatened by the S.A.C.C.'s resolution and how they can respond to it, any more real than my reflections on how both the Defence Force and the militant opposition movements are threatened by the resolution? Does the Prime Minister's prediction that the S.A.C.C.'s resolution will fall on deaf ears also apply to how the churches will receive the final paragraph and its consequences?

Quite frankly, I don't know. And because I don't know whether the churches will respond to the challenge to contribute a portion of their income and the value of their assets to the economic and educational development of 'blacks', I'm afraid that the Hammanskraal resolution may destroy what remains of the moral credibility of the S.A.C.C. and its member churches. After all, why should the Government, or anyone else, pay attention to the churches' pronouncements on the ills of our society while we are such good examples of what is wrong with our country? ★

SALVATOR MUNDI (SAVIOR OF THE WORLD)

Let the pitifulness of thy great mercy
Loose us from our sins, we humbly beseech thee.
Make it appear that thou art our Saviour and mighty
Deliverer:
O save us that we may praise thee, we humbly beseech
thee.●

the root of the matter

"COUNTER -SUBVERSION"

peter randall

The SACC resolution on conscientious objection is a significant milestone in the development of a Christian commitment to oppose injustice in South Africa and to refuse to support the instruments that maintain injustice.

One of the most important aspects of the SACC conference was the sense of urgency that is conveyed. Time is short, the conference was in effect proclaiming, and the urgent, desperate need is for fundamental and speedy change, before the forces of polarisation and conflict tear our society asunder.

This sense of urgency has clearly been sharpened by a number of developments in Southern Africa, of which the most significant, in historical terms, has been the lurch towards independence in Mozambique and Angola.

In view of this, it is fascinating to learn more of the background to the events in these countries, particularly in view of the possible light they can throw on the present and future situation in South Africa itself.

IDOC (International Documentation in the Contemporary Church) has recently provided us with a signal service by making available a little volume containing secret government documents on "counter-subversion" which derive from a symposium in Angola in 1968 at which leading figures in the Portuguese army, PIDE and various police and administrative leaders were present. (*Angola: Secret Government Documents on Counter-Subversion*: IDOC, Rome, \$4.00. The original documents were "liberated" and passed on to the Angola Committee in Holland who translated some of them into Dutch).

The papers give us, as the editors say, "an extraordinary insight into the administration of Portugal's African colonies as presented ... by the officials who were responsible for training and implementing the policies which have led to the present situation".

For the South African reader, viewing these documents against current affairs in this country, it rapidly becomes clear that the concerns and the techniques of white minority regimes do not differ all that much. There is the emphasis on psychological preparedness (the "war psychosis" referred to at Hammanskraal?).

"Counter-subversion requires the mentalization of the entire nation by means of a well-oriented psychological action-program; people have to be fully convinced of the indisputable necessity to defend the national territory. Everyone has to be ready to put all his efforts and material means into the combat against subversion" (note also the fondness of jargon, and the comforting vagueness of concepts like "subversion").

There is the emphasis on control and "supervision". African populations likely to be influenced by "subversive elements" must be "regrouped" into "concentration centres" where "control will be easier if they are located close to a village or a police or a military station". Vast shifting around of settled African communities to fit the plans of white minority regimes is, of course, a common feature of Rhodesia and South Africa (vide the SACC resolution on the Lebowa removals).

Control of movement must be exercised by means of identification documents. A network of informers must be established, who "should never be allowed to know one another, in order that they cannot make common cause, and also to make it easier to establish the degree of reliability of each by comparing the information received".

And of course the whole system of information-gathering, control and supervision must be centralised in a co-ordinating bureaucracy, in Angola called a General Council of Counter-Subversion, in South Africa called BOSS.

Propaganda and control of the radio are, of course, important: "we fight with the same weapons as the enemy: a few real facts are presented in such a way that they cater to the taste for whatever is fantastic proper to the African population, to whom the transmissions are specifically addressed". And here is a significant little plea from a brigadier of PIDE: "It is necessary for Angola to have television ... (diversion from listening to enemy radio programs) ... only radios which can receive exclusively *medium-wave* should be sold".

churches are a problem

The role of the Churches is particularly worrying: "We think it absolutely necessary to neutralise the disastrous activity of the Protestant missions which, under the guise of disseminating religious principles, continue openly to instil in the unprepared minds of the native masses an erroneous idea of nationalism, an ideal opposed to the *sacred interests* (my italics) of the Portuguese nation".

For those who might piously and unthinkingly reject any notion that European rulers could resort to

atrocities and massacres, there is a soberingly candid statement by a police captain on the value of violence. "One thing that can have a direct effect ... is the use of violence: undermining elements are punished most severely ... violence still is a strong argument, especially when applied against blacks, whose whole concept of God is embedded in the idea of violence".

This cursory sampling of the views of the various Portuguese military leaders, policemen and administrators charged with the task of implementing an imperialist and unpopular policy in Angola may not come as much surprise to anyone aware to some extent of Southern African realities.

What did come as a surprise to me, at least, was the repeated recognition, even by PIDE officials, of something of the true nature of the problems in Angola: "Among the Europeans, and in particular among the less educated, there is a tendency when dealing with Africans to adopt a feeling of superiority ... these Europeans do not always know how to distinguish an advanced African ... and they often pass on to generalisation".

the root of the matter

**IS CAESAR
NOT GOD?**

brian brown

It's just as well I don't live in the U.S.A. There I would have sought to defend the God-given authorities of Nixon, Agnew, Mitchell, Haldeman & Co., only to see my unpatriotic and ungodly fellow citizens white-anting the very authority which is from God. I suppose Nixon's resignation is a case of the Lord hath given, the Lord hath taken away, blessed be the ways of God and Watergate.

It's just as well I don't live in Uganda. After a heavy meal and a bad dream General Idi Amin could always demand that as a loyal patriot I should kill some of Obote's boys as fodder for the Nile crocodiles. With all

Racial prejudice results in racial discrimination: "In the struggle against counter-subversion it will be of special importance to give back to the Africans their self-respect, through the elimination of all discrimination in every sphere whatsoever, but especially in the sphere of labour".

Economic exploitation by whites and the contract labour system are seen clearly as root causes of the conflict, together with a recognition that even when the authorities instituted changes, "we sometimes had the concern to look after our own interests. Whereas on the one hand we wanted a change in order to avoid negative criticism, on the other hand we felt it just as easy to maintain the former situation".

What several of the participants in the Counter-subversion Symposium—ironically enough, particularly members of the hated secret police—pleaded for was urgent, fundamental structural change in the society as the only effective means of maintaining peace. This is what the SACC conference called for too. ★

authority given of God, I could hardly be disobedient to the Divine Vision/nightmare, could I?

It's just as well I missed the mass purges of the Stalin era. For that period God's authority was vested in a crew who had a field day exterminating Christians and Communists alike. As one loyal to the Authoritative Voice I would have had to indulge in the Divinely sanctioned blood-baths as sure as God made little apples and Caesars.

Just as well I missed the Third Reich era under Hitler. Even though I know all authority is given of God, in zealously performing the Nazi decrees of Dachau, Buchenwald and Auschwitz, this loyal patriot and disciple might have developed a few theological reservations. But then, God moves in a mysterious way...

It's just as well that I've lived outside of these historical situations, for even though I'm reared to see authority as of God (at the risk of being blasphemous) I'm not sure whether I always respect God's choice. If all authority is of God, then He has some strange bed-fellows.

But these stupid reservations are the product of thinking, not faith. As the authoritative radio keeps on telling me, its belief that counts—belief that we must render all things unto Caesar.

It's just as well that my belief in all authority being of God is not tested by a Nixon or an Amin, a Stalin or a Hitler— I've got Christian Nationalism.

And what with sentences of 10 years or R10 000 pending for just disagreeing with Caesar, it's just as well that I live in South Africa. Fancy having to live in a country where God and Caesar are divided! ★



There has been talk of martyrdom in South Africa. Talk, not by irresponsible extremists nor by wild left-wing radicals—but by two responsible representatives of the Roman Catholic Church.

Archbishop Denis Hurley of Durban has warned that Government and Church may collide over the provisions of the Defence Act Amendment Bill. If so, he asserts, there could be a “rash” of Christian martyrs. Owen Cardinal McCann of Cape Town has been reported as agreeing with Archbishop Hurley.

It is therefore with heightened interest that Christians will watch the coming series of church national meetings. The Executive Commission of the Presbyterian Church of Southern Africa meets in September. Several of its leading members have already dissociated themselves from the now notorious Hammanskraal resolution of the S.A. Council of Churches (though one of these was actually at Hammanskraal and took part in the voting). The official reaction of the PCSA is therefore perhaps a foregone conclusion.

In October the Assembly of the Methodist Church meets. The result of their deliberations is less certain, for this body is hardly renowned for its outstanding proclamations on South Africa's problems.

Perhaps the most interesting of the church meetings will be that of the Anglican Church, to be held in Durban in November. The Provincial Standing Committee has been outspoken in the past, but this time one of its members is Bishop Philip Russell of Port Elizabeth who has a son serving on the border. He had sufficient reservations at Hammanskraal to propose that the meeting pass on to the next business when debate began on the controversial resolution. The Durban Standing Committee has a majority white membership—despite the fact that 75% of its constituency is black.

One wonders then if Archbishop Hurley is correct in his forecast. Surely it is far more likely that our white-dominated churches (while perhaps making agreeable noises) will sweep this issue under the carpet?

Let there be one firm voice of warning to those churches which have a predominately black membership. The Government has not increased defence spending to R700 million for nothing. Nor is it coincidental that, as South Africa builds up its war machine, the authorities are recruiting black soldiers!

What is now mainly a white problem could, in the very near future, become a major issue for blacks. Why after all should there not be a system of selective compulsory national service for blacks? Should that happen, the churches may rue the day that a “white” theology led them to certain conclusions.

the root of the matter

CONFORMERS
OR MARTYRS?

michael maasdorp

revelation ntoula

looking back on lausanne

Two main points were clear about the International Congress on World Evangelisation which concluded in Lausanne last week. One was that it aimed at evangelising the rest of the non-Christian world before the end of the 20th century, the other was that it was composed primarily of conservative "evangelical" Christians who apparently were thinking of setting up some sort of "rival" to the World Council of Churches, which represents the ecumenical movement.

Briefly, the difference between the "evangelicals" and the "ecumenicals" is that the former tended to distinguish sharply between the spiritual and social aspects of the Gospel, laying the greatest emphasis on the spiritual. Their general attitude was one of "all is well if the spirit is well".

However, a definite message which came from the International Congress is that the Church can no longer afford to ignore social issues. One of the main speakers, the Rev. George Hoffman of the United States, was wildly applauded when he told the 5 000 participants: "As Christians for whom the Bible is the supreme authority, we have just as much, if not more, right to be

concerned for man's total development as anyone." Unfortunately, he said, the evangelical voice has seldom been heard where social matters were concerned.

The same message was spelled out clearly by speakers from all over the world, especially those from the "Third World" (Africa, Asia and Latin America). Speakers also stressed the importance of the "liberation of the whole man". Although all agreed that spiritual deliverance was of utmost importance, most attached the same importance to the bodily needs of man. "For too long the Church has played the ostrich by turning a blind eye to the world's social problems," said Dr. B. Hill, an Afro-American evangelist.

Speakers from the Third World seemed to argue that the so-called conservative evangelicalism as known in the Western World, was a luxury that underdeveloped countries could not afford. The basis of their argument was that in the Third World, and especially in Africa, religion and everyday life could not be divorced.

Although representatives from the Third World were in a decided minority—constituting only 15% of the Congress—their views made a big impression.

Another factor which made an impression on the Congress was an exclusive meeting called by participants from underdeveloped countries. All seemed agreed that the tone of the Congress, which was dominated by participants from the West, did not relate to their home situations. A continuation committee composed of Blacks from the Third World was established as a result. It is to look into the social implications of the Gospel in their home situations.

World Evangelisation

What about the main purpose of the Congress—the task of world evangelisation? Many papers were delivered on this subject, and strategies suggested. Dr. Byang Kato, a Nigerian theologian for instance, stressed the importance of recognising a peoples' culture in evangelising them. Too often, he said, the Gospel was presented in foreign terms. He levelled criticism at missionaries who identified Western culture with the Gospel.

But the weakness of the Congress in this regard was that evangelism was seen as being directed at the Third World most of the time. Some participants from the underdeveloped countries put their finger on this weakness when they argued that if the West once had been "evangelised", it was in serious need of a revival. They accused the West of moral bankruptcy.

Failing to take in the whole world in their evangelistic vision, the organisers of the Congress fell short of their aims in this regard.

The WCC "rival"

Although speculation was rife that an international organisation running parallel to the WCC would be born of the Congress, the odds against such an eventuality seemed to grow as the Congress progressed. Blacks from all over the world appeared to be against

the idea of a new world body, and some Whites aligned themselves with the Blacks on this.

Black opinion was that although certain activities of the WCC were open to criticism, it would be better for the "evangelical" churches to seek membership in the WCC and change it from within. While opinion on the question of a new body was canvassed in questionnaires distributed at the Congress—and produced a large majority in favour of such a proposal—no formal proposal for the formation of a new body came forward. Instead, a continuation committee of 25 members was formed, but its terms of reference were vague.

It seemed to me that the reaction of Third World delegates to the idea of a WCC "rival" had a big influence in stifling the move. I can also say that a report in South African newspapers that the WCC had issued a statement to the effect that the move to form a rival at Lausanne had failed, is not true. No WCC statement was issued.

South Africans Agree on Need for Inter-Church Talks

An urgent need for talks among churches in South Africa emerged during meetings of the South African "National Strategy Group" at the Congress.

The group, composed of about 65 South Africans at the Congress, met on four occasions to consider evangelisation in terms of the S.A. situation. The participants consisted of members of the Dutch Reformed, Methodist, Anglican, Presbyterian, Nazarene, Assemblies of God, Moravian, Lutheran, African Methodist Episcopal, Baptist and African Evangelical churches.

About two-thirds of the participants were White. They included some of the Dutch Reformed Church's top theologians such as Prof. Dawid Bosch and Dr. Johannes Kotze. Among the Black participants were Anglican Bishop Alpheus Zulu, who is one of the World Council of Churches' Presidents, Dean Andrew Makhene of the African Methodist Episcopal Church, and the Rev. Maurice Ngakane, head of the division of Mission and Evangelism of the South African Council of Churches.

Although there were clear differences of opinion between a majority of Whites and a majority of Blacks, the Black-White dividing line was not clear cut. A small number of Whites, both English and Afrikaans speaking, identified themselves with those Blacks who tended to take a liberal line during the meetings. Similarly, a small group of the Blacks identified themselves with the conservative thinking adopted by most Whites.

The group was sharply divided into two when most Whites suggested that Dr. Billy Graham be invited to preach in South Africa within the next two years. "He would be a blessing to South Africa," was the reason. Rigorous rejection of the idea by the Blacks led to the meeting deciding to abandon it.

Blacks maintained that priority should be given to

talks among churches in South Africa in order to resolve the race issue before they could think of inviting outsiders. Some Whites had suggested that Dr. Graham be invited either under the auspices of the Dutch Reformed Church or the University of South Africa. A suggestion by Prof. Calvin Cook of Rhodes University that Dr. Graham be invited by the Mission and Evangelism division of the S.A. Council of Churches was rejected.

A big majority agreed that there was need for church talks in South Africa.

A statement dealing with the race situation in S.A. which was presented by Dean Andrew Makhene was rejected by the group on two grounds. White participants said they needed time to study it and secondly, some Whites expressed the belief that "it is wrong for anyone to be forced into accepting a statement he had not been involved in preparing." Bishop Zulu supported this attitude.

The statement stressed the social responsibility of Christians and urged the Church in S.A. to be concerned with "change of attitudes between the races." It also emphasised the equality of men and the dignity of man.

At the end of the meeting, Mr. Michael Cassidy, leader of the Africa Enterprise, again stressed the need for talks between churches in S.A. He accused the so-called English-speaking churches of being "too muscular" in their attitude towards the Dutch Reformed Churches. Too often, he said, the English-speaking churches were too ready to attack the Afrikaans-speaking ones, especially through the Press.

On the other hand, he said, the Afrikaans-speaking churches had been unwilling to meet with other churches for talks. Turning to the Blacks, Mr. Cassidy warned them not to be "too powerful" as this attitude would frighten the Whites.

A "fellowship continuation committee" was formed in order to pursue the idea of church talks. It will not have an easy task. It emerged from the discussions that while Dutch Reformed churches' participants were agreed that South Africa had problems, a large majority tended to go round the problem by theologising it. "God will solve the problem in His own time and way", they say.

On the other hand, the Blacks adopted the attitude of "Through God's Grace, the problem can be solved by man." This difference in approach would certainly cause a disagreement between Whites and Blacks if the committee succeeds in arranging the talks. Another problem would be caused by the conservative element in the Evangelical churches, who still believe that the church must not engage in social issues.

Some Personal Impressions

The spirit of Christian fellowship which existed among the 5 000 participants, speakers, visitors and newsmen during the ten-day Lausanne Congress, was a rarity. The atmosphere around Palais de Beaulieu, the Congress centre, resembled that of the Mount of Trans-

figuration.

"God is great, alleluia! I'm praying for you day and night brother!" These were some of the common expressions used by people. When I consulted an Indian Congress doctor who was a participant and also ran a clinic in the Congress premises, he said a short prayer for me before prescribing some flu tablets. "God will help you", he whispered as I left the clinic.

Spontaneous singing of choruses during lunch breaks became a common sound outside the Palais. All in all, everybody seemed caught up in a heavenly atmosphere.

In private discussions, people seemed little interested in "worldly things." These included the Cyprus situation, the Watergate affair and other issues of international importance. The general attitude adopted was that of "give Caesar what belongs to him, and give God what is His."

By the same token, plenary sessions of the Congress kept clear of anything considered to be outside the realm

of the Church. When the Cyprus crisis was first known in the Congress, all that Dr. Billy Graham said was to ask the Congress to pray for that country.

At the end the Congress pledged itself to reach every corner of the world with the Gospel by the year 2000. This, the Congress maintained, is in accordance with Christ's command "go ye..."

In the final analysis however, very little appears to have been achieved by the Congress. During interviews with some of the participants, none seemed positive as to what the Congress aim was, apart from the idea of evangelising the world. While it may be too early to judge how fruitful the resolution of evangelising the world will be, one thing is clear: *the Third World is as concerned with social issues which involve development in their own countries as with the evangelisation of the world.*

—*Ecunews*, 29.7.74.

CARLETONVILLE, SEPTEMBER 11TH. 1973

chico mitsui

Thoughts at the vigil for the eleven miners killed—one year later

The mellow light from the skylight
embraced our pensive silence
a pair of gum boots with squeezing sound
toes forcing their way out
passed by my bowed head
carried the heavy steps to a pew.

He settled himself beside another in torn overalls
his head slowly moved toward the coffin
laid in the centre aisle
symbol of those dead eleven:
six tall candles like six pall bearers

For those who were shot
in that riot—riot? so they say
five of them his countrymen
his eyes closed
his head bent

He is one of the lucky ones
no matter how poor he is
padding of his torn oversized jacket
hanging like wounded flesh

He is a lucky one—
now has a home with two rondavels
family and a job
tending other people's gardens
also worked in a mine over the border once
like almost every man in the country.

But did not get lost
did not get shot
did not evaporate
did not lose his mind
and was lucky enough to come home
in one piece
with nothing worse than an afflicted chest.

But his eldest son is still in one of those mines
with eight thousand miners
men, strong men, sweating men
in that fenced compound
day in and day out herded down to the hole
like a herd of bulls whipped down the mountain.

Day in and day out herded back to the compound
to the concrete bunk in a crowded barrack
in his weary closed eyes
as in a film shown in the compound community centre
he saw his girl with one of his home boys
gay and laughing hand in hand.

He kicked his feet up
to go for more drink before
he lay his body once more
on the hard bunk for the night...
with a shiver, he shook his head and
opened his eyes.

Kneeling in the pew
with the others in silence
saw the coffin in the soft light from the window above
five coffins now being delivered at the airport. ★

WEIGHED AND ...?

WITS CARTOONIST LOSES CITIZENSHIP

Last week Mr Frescura, who formerly held Italian citizenship, was called to police headquarters at John Vorster Square and handed a notice signed by the Secretary for the Interior.

The notice said note had been taken of Mr Frescura's conviction in August last year on charges of defaming the Prime Minister, Mr Vorster, and the Leader of the Opposition, Sir De Villiers Graaff. This conviction arose from publication of Wits Student cartoons.

The notice said that as Mr Frescura had been convicted of a criminal offence within five years of having taken out South African citizenship the matter had been submitted to the Minister of the Interior, "who has in consequence decided to deprive you of your South African citizenship under powers vested in him by Section 19 (3) (d) of the South African Citizenship Act".

—*Rand Daily Mail, 10.7.74.*

ITALIANS WILL NOT TAKE UP FRESCURA CASE

The Italian Embassy would not take up the case of Mr Franco Frescura with the South African Government, an embassy spokesman said in Pretoria yesterday.

"He is a South African and has a problem with his own Government. What must we do with the South African Government for a South African citizen", he said.

According to Italian law, Mr Frescura would have to apply for Italian citizenship if he wanted it, and would have to first live in Italy for two years, he said.

—*Rand Daily Mail, 11.7.74.*

FRESCURA CAN STAY

Mr Franco Frescura has permanent residence rights in South Africa, Mr J.L.S. Fourie, Secretary for the Department of the Interior, confirmed yesterday.

Mr Frescura, the University of the Witwatersrand student cartoonist, was deprived of his South African citizenship last week. A former Italian citizen, he is now stateless.

The Government's action means he is not a South African, but he had permanent residence rights here, Mr Fourie said.

—*Rand Daily Mail, 12.7.74*

HARSH PENALTY

Mr Franco Frescura, an architectural student at Wits University, has been deprived of his citizenship. His crime is that he drew some vulgar, distasteful cartoons of the Prime Minister and the Leader of the Opposition.

For that crime Mr Frescura has already paid a penalty. He was rusticated by the university authorities and then fined for criminal defamation.

Now, a year later, he is rendered stateless as punishment for the same offence—an unbelievably harsh penalty for a youthful indiscretion. One shudders at the appalling inferiority complex of a government which cannot tolerate the criticism, however brash, of a young man who cares about the destiny of his adopted land.

Mr Frescura, who came from Italy at the age of nine, was naturalised six years ago when he was 22—and a fat lot of good it has done him. His experience must fill other naturalised citizens with alarm and may well deter many resident aliens from taking out South African citizenship. Who wants a citizenship that can be snuffed out on the flimsiest pretext and on such an arbitrary basis—

The treatment of Mr Frescura suggests that the Government demands from naturalised citizens a standard which it cannot command from ordinary citizens, namely, impeccable political behaviour. This is hardly the way to encourage people to become naturalised. The point will doubtless occur to resident aliens that, once naturalised, they are safe only if they become political eunuchs in the land of their adoption. They have the clearest evidence that a hostile or vulgar attitude to the Nationalist Government can evoke harsh, ruthless retribution.

What a way to woo new citizens!

—*Sunday Times, 14.7.74.*

GEWEEG EN ...?

FEWER PEOPLE BANNED NOW

The number of people banned from attending gatherings under the Suppression of Communism Act is declining rapidly, and for the first time is now under the 200 mark.

Official figures obtained from the Department of Justice in Pretoria yesterday show that, on June 30 this year, 186 people were still banned under this particular section of the Act.

Of them 31 were Whites with expiry dates on their notices up to 1979.

On June 30 last year bannings totalled 200 (29 Whites); in 1972 they totalled 237 (28 Whites).

In 1971 there were 274 (30 Whites), in 1970 there were 280 (42 Whites) and in 1969 the total was 355 (50 Whites).

A spokesman for the department said yesterday that no consolidation list had as yet been prepared on the number of people who had been listed as communists. The total was still in the region of 500.

—*Rand Daily Mail*, 30.7.74.

NUSAS AND HAMMANSKRAAL

Nearly all the responses to the S.A.C.C. stand on Conscientious Objection have been typically negative and short-sighted. Their resolution calls above all for a deeply considered response to the escalating conflict on our borders.

It is the young people of South Africa who are being called upon to fight this war. Many of us are questioning two fundamental issues relating to this conflict.

Firstly, the readiness with which the government is committing the people of South Africa to a prolonged war in defence of a system which promotes and protects the interest of whites and which discriminates at all levels against blacks.

Secondly, the repression of organized and peaceful black opposition to the conditions of domination and exploitation in our society has been responsible for black fellow South Africans taking up arms. It could be argued that we are being called upon to fight a civil war, the cause of which is rooted in the inequalities of our society.

If we are to seek sincerely a peaceful resolution to this conflict it is issues such as these which must be openly and fully debated. But the government, through its propaganda is developing a widespread war psychosis which blindly clings to militarism as the only cause of action open for resolving this conflict.

Many of us believe that this war can be avoided if the inequalities in our society are rooted out if the aspirations of blacks to share equally in the political process and the wealth of the land are met.

But in the absence of any sincere indication by the government that they intend meeting these aspirations and for as long as we are called upon to fight a war about which we have grave reservations, we must weigh up seriously the merits of conscientious objection.

We associate ourselves with the stand taken by the S.A.C.C. and call upon all students at affiliated centres to challenge their conscience on this matter.

SIGNED: NUSAS EXECUTIVE
SRC PRESIDENTS: WITS
UCT
UND
UNP

NUSAS LOCAL CHAIR: RHODES (where there is no S.R.C.)

Press Statement, 5.8.74.

CONSCIENCE

The South African Council of Churches has touched a tender nerve with its suggestion that Christian South Africans should consider the subject of conscientious objection to military service as a moral matter, in regard to fighting a war which could be seen to be a war in defence of the indefensible policy of apartheid.

Several things can be said about the resolution. One is that it took courage to propose it. Another is that the subject is well worth examination, regardless of its emotional complexity.

It is perfectly true that the morality of armed service cannot be determined only by politicians in a ruling government.

It is ironical that Dr. J.D. Vorster should imply that Christians should fight any war their government decides to declare, on the theory of rendering unto Caesar that which is Caesar's. It is ironical because within living memory Dr. Vorster and his brother, the Prime Minister, not only refused to fight for the South African Army when the South African Government of 1939 declared war on Nazi Germany, but actively opposed the war effort—Mr B.J. Vorster rising to prominence in a subversive movement called the Ossewa-brandwag.

Who rendered what to Caesar then? Doesn't the Bible apply if Caesar is a Sap?

No, the matter is not so simple as Dr. Vorster makes it out to be. It is established Christian ethics that a Christian must obey his individual conscience if this clashes with the edicts of rulers, and it so happens that we can well understand how the Prime Minister at that time refused to fight for what he regarded as an unjust cause.

In our view, the churchman who summed the matter up best was Archdeacon E.G. Welton of East London, who said that while it could not automatically be the duty of Christians to engage in war whenever the State demanded it, it was also not automatic that a just war could never be fought by an unjust regime.

In other words, defence of South Africa against aggression is not automatically a defence of apartheid, and even if such aggression is aimed basically against the evil of apartheid, such aggression is not automatically just in its nature and method.

It is rather like Hain's demo cause. The basic overall standpoint—fairness in selection of teams—is a noble one, but methods such as violent invasion of playing areas are wrong. And as far as military aggressors are concerned, we cannot even be sure that their basic overall aim is the establishment of

a just society in South Africa.

This is one of those questions that needs full examination and debate, and the churchmen did their proper duty in initiating such debate.

—*Daily Dispatch*, 6.8.74.

ON CONSCIENTIOUS OBJECTION

The recent resolution of the South African Council of Churches calling on its member churches to:

“challenge all their members to consider ... whether Christ’s call to take up the Cross and follow Him in identifying with the oppressed does not, in our situation, involve becoming conscientious objectors”

has importance for a broader group of people than Christians.

The imminent liberation and independence of Mocambique and Angola from colonial rule means that South Africa’s borders will become increasingly vulnerable to guerilla attacks. As the war on our border escalates, so more and more people will be called up to fight the guerilla movements, actively and defend the borders.

Many people are already feeling that active service on the border does not constitute protection for the people of South Africa, but protection for the minority white governments. Accordingly, the issue of conscientious objection is being discussed more openly as an alternative to involvement in an unjust war.

The feeling of those who subscribe to this viewpoint, is that the solution to attacks on our borders cannot be found in military action, but in political, social and economic reforms within South Africa.

Obviously, the issue of whether to fight or not will affect white students more and more. If people are going to fight, they must know why they are accepting the call to action. Merely to drift into an important decision like that, would be tragic.

Many wars could have been avoided if the average soldier had considered whose interests he was advancing by wearing a uniform.

On the other hand, a decision to become a conscientious objector is a serious one, and it would be foolish to suggest this as a course of action without considerable thought and introspection being given to the matter.

Students on this campus must begin to face up to these options, and decide rationally on a course of action.

At present, too many people merely drift along the path of mediocrity and sterility because that is the way the wind is blowing. What we must decide is whether the force of that wind is justifiable or not.

Nearly all the responses to the South African Council of Churches’ stand on conscientious objection have been typically negative and short-sighted. Their resolution calls, above all, for a deeply considered response to the escalating conflict on our borders.

It is the young people of South Africa who are being called upon to fight this war. Many of us are questioning two fundamental issues relating to this conflict.

Firstly, the readiness with which the Government is committing the people of South Africa to a prolonged war in defence of a system which promotes and protects the interests of Whites and which discriminates, at all levels, against Blacks.

Secondly, the repression of organised and peaceful Black opposition to the condition of domination and exploitation in our society has been responsible for Black fellow South Africans taking up arms. It could be argued that we are being called upon to fight a civil war, the cause of which is rooted in the inequalities of our society.

If we are to seek sincerely a peaceful resolution to this conflict it is issues such as these which must be openly and fully debated. But the Government, through its propaganda is developing a widespread war psychosis which blindly clings to militarism as the only course of action open for resolving this conflict.

Many of us believe that this war can be avoided if the inequalities in our society are rooted out; if the aspirations of the Blacks to share equally in the political process and the wealth of the land are met.

But in the absence of any sincere indication by the Government that they intend meeting these aspirations, and for as long as we are called upon to fight a war about which we have grave reservations, we must weigh up seriously the merits of conscientious objection.

We associate ourselves with the stand taken by the South African Council of Churches and call upon all students and affiliated centres to challenge their consciences on this matter.

SOME QUESTIONS...

1. Why is there a war on our borders?
2. If you fight in this war, what will you be defending?
3. Do you believe in the dictum “My country right or wrong”?
4. Can a war which defends an unjust system be a just war?
5. Why have some people taken up arms to liberate their country?

THE ANSWERS?

1. Is it because a group of ‘communists’ want to take over the world ... or is it because some black South Africans see no other way to achieve a stake in their country?
2. Will you be defending your right to a peaceful and productive life ... or will you be defending other peoples right to separate the races, discriminate against all but themselves, pay poverty-level wages, split up families, and repress all but their own kind?
3. Does ‘my country right or wrong’ mean ‘the ruling class right or wrong’ ... or does it mean that the interests of the whole population should be set above sectional privilege?
4. There is a war on South Africa’s borders because the whole world has come to despise the system of apartheid. The world accepts its responsibility for South Africa’s oppressed, as the world recognised its duty to defend

those oppressed by Hitler's regime. South Africa's war effort must therefore be in defence of a fundamentally unjust society. Does the true patriot aim at protecting or changing that society?

5. Is it because the guerilla forces are ruthless men who enjoy living in the bush, laying traps, killing and being killed ... or is it because they believe that all legitimate means to improve their lot were cut off by South Africa's privileged elite, and that violence is their answer to South Africa's institutionalised repression?

G. Moss, SRC, Wits.

MORE PEOPLE WANT TO LEAVE SOUTH AFRICA

There has been a sharp increase in the number of inquiries from people in South Africa interested in leaving the country, foreign consulate spokesmen disclosed this week.

One major consulate in Johannesburg is receiving up to 250 inquiries a month from South Africans who are thinking of settling abroad.

Emigration to Australia and Canada, which has kept a fairly constant level since 1970, is expected to rise appreciably this year.

Emigration to Canada in the first three months of this year was already up by almost 60 per cent on the 1973 first quarter figures.

An Australian immigration official in Pretoria is expecting a record 1 700 people from South Africa to settle in Australia this year.

Emigration to New Zealand, which is handled in South Africa by the British Embassy, is understood to be at a fairly high level, but British representatives refused to give any indication of the volume.

Consular representative were unanimous that inquiries from South Africans wanting to emigrate had increased sharply in recent months, as had applications for immigrant visas.

But actual emigration had not risen dramatically, as countries were becoming more selective.

—Sunday Express, 11.8.74.

LEBOWA REJECTS BANNING POWERS

Lebowa wanted no part of the evil power of banning and had made its stand clear to the South African Government, the homeland's Minister of the Interior, Mr Collins Ramusi, said yesterday.

He was commenting on the Bantu Laws Amendment Bill, under which Pretoria proposes to give homeland governments the power to ban "Bantu" individuals and organisations within the homelands.

Mr Ramusi said: "We do not desire powers to ban people. We do not wish to be given evil powers. What we want is a Bill

of Rights guaranteeing the freedom of all people in Lebowa, irrespective of colour".

The Minister of Bantu Administration and Development, Mr M.C. Botha, had sent a copy of the Bill to the Lebowa Government for its comments. Mr Ramusi said.

"But it was rejected unanimously by the whole Cabinet".

According to a spokesman for the Department of Bantu Administration, the Bill was drawn up and presented to Parliament at the request of some homeland governments.

He declined to specify which homeland governments".

Rand Daily Mail, 14.8.74.

DEFENCE GRABS 18,5 pc

The increase of R330-million in defence expenditure equal to the total defence budget for 1964/65 means the Government is now spending R702-million on this item.

This sum is 18,5 per cent of the total Budget. Past Budget figures show that South Africa's defence expenditure has risen steadily over the past decade with the increases stepping up sharply in the last two or three years.

In the 1964-65 year, defence spending totalled R230-million. Last year the figure was R472 022 000. The country has spent more than R2 864-million on defence in the past 10 years.

United States Control and Disarmament Agency figures for 1972 showed that South Africa was spending more money per citizen on defence than any other country in Africa south of the Sahara.

These figures show that in 1970, the country was spending R13,50 on defence for every citizen in the country.

Rand Daily Mail, 15.8.74.

EVIDENCE "SWIPED"

Mrs Helen Suzman, Progressive Party MP for Houghton, said in Parliament on Friday that a great deal of evidence submitted to the Schlebusch Commission came from "confidential documents swiped on raids, from intercepted letters, from diaries that mysteriously vanished between Frankfurt and D.F. Malan airports and monitored phone calls".

Mrs Suzman, taking part in debate on the Schlebusch report on Nusas, said these documents were given to the commission by the Security Police and/or the Bureau for State Security.

"If, on the basis of such evidence, the commission has reached the conclusion that sinister subversion was afoot, what on earth were all our security forces doing in the meanwhile?" asked Mrs Suzman.

'Revoltling'

"The first security raid on Nusas took place as early as February, 1971, a year before the select committee was appointed and two years before it first reported. Fancy leaving these dangerous characters on the loose all that time. Grossly irresponsible!"

Mrs Suzman said that she found the Schlebusch affair ex-

tremely depressing even though the Prime Minister might have found it all "madly patriotic".

"Personally, I find the spectacle of 10 grown men—powerful men—spending untold hours poring over the private diaries and letters of young men and women, questioning them about their love lives, pursuing them relentlessly, all rather revolting".

Rejected

Mrs Suzman said that the Progressive Party rejected the report and introduced a motion calling on the State President to scrap the commission immediately.

Sunday Times, 18.8.74.

A WORTHLESS VERDICT

A big song-and-dance is being made about the Schlebusch-Le Grange report, but when the dust has settled it will be seen that the report is not worth the paper it is written on.

Mr Vorster should have realised this in advance. And so should Messrs Murray, Sutton and Malan, the three United Party members of the commission.

Here, after all, is a report which makes grave accusations against institutions and people. One would expect, before such accusations were made, that the inquiry would follow the procedure adopted in a court of law. That is the accepted method of electing the truth, and of giving an accused a proper chance to defend himself.

Nothing like that can be said of the Schlebusch Commission. On almost every material point its procedure is the antithesis of that found in a court of law. Here are some of the disquieting differences between Schlebusch and a court of law:

- The inquiry was held in secret.
- The accused persons were not presented with a formal indictment of the charges against them, and therefore did not know precisely the charges they were called upon to answer.
- When the "accused" gave evidence they could not in fact be sure whether they were accused or witnesses.
- The "accused" did not hear anyone else's evidence and therefore were not able to cross-examine witnesses.

Yet a secret inquiry applying these procedures, in which the "accused" are defenceless and undefended, has seen fit to bring accusations of a most serious kind.

The commission's procedures are in complete conflict with the principles of justice, and its findings on that account must be regarded as worthless. All one can do now is to warn the public that they should not accept findings arrived at by a tribunal which has operated in secret and has denied the so-called guilty persons the chance of defending themselves according to the recognised procedures of a court of law. The branding of Nusas and some of its members, in such circumstances, is most deplorable.

As for the three United Party commissioners, it is some consolation to know that the UP voters of Orange Grove gave their verdict in no uncertain terms by inflicting upon Mr Etienne Malan perhaps the most humiliating defeat ever suffered by a UP candidate. It is a matter for regret that the voters of Green Point were not equally perceptive.

That the Government should spawn an inquiry of this kind is not in the least surprising. This is what one expects of it. The badge of shame rests chiefly on the United Party, which ought to have known better than to link itself with this "secret court".

The fact, that Mr Vorster is now handing the matter over to the Attorney-General is poor consolation for the Nusas members publicly branded after a secret "trial". Why was this not done in the first place? But at least Mr Vorster's decision contains a clear admission that he was wrong in banning the eight Nusas leaders without trial.

Sunday Times, 18.8.74.

REFLECTIONS AT A BLACK SASH STAND

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

Helen Kotzé



migrant labour