



challenge



WHAT IS THERE to say about the forthcoming general election? The white 20% of the adult population will go to the polls to elect an all-white parliament. Of the three parties at present represented in parliament, the Nationalists have 106 seats, the United Party 49 and the Progressives one. At each election since 1948, the Nationalists have increased their representation and it is unlikely that this trend will be reversed in this election (if the Republican Party wins any seats this will merely accentuate the movement to the right). To the left of the three parties in parliament is the Liberal Party which is not contesting the election, to the right the Republican Party which has a number of candidates. The political movements of non-whites have all been banned; only puppet organisations exist, denied any access to 'white' politics (whatever this cant phrase may mean).

What is there to say about the general election? Those who have been imprisoned without trial, banned or exiled can say nothing. Many more will say nothing because they have been intimidated (let those who have less to lose and more to expiate throw the first stone). There are still more, the vast majority of our people, who can say nothing because there is no way in which what they have to say can be heard. For these South Africans the election is irrelevant: under whatever government it produces, the 'interest' of whites will prevail in every matter where there is conflict between the interests of non-whites and whites. The rape of District Six in Cape Town is the latest sickening example of the political theory which says that only whites are responsible enough to exercise political power: like many an individual rape case in this country the guilty white party will suffer marginally if at all and the innocent non-whites will bear the brunt of suffering.

What is there to say about the general election? Let us summarise the franchise policies of the political parties. The Nationalists will never allow the vote to Coloureds, Indians or urban Africans: the United Party will not allow the vote to Indians or Africans, whether the latter are urban or not: the Republicans aim to restrict the vote to white only. Of the parties

An Independent Review

EDITED BY CATHOLIC LAYMEN

Volume Three

FEBRUARY 1966

Number One

FINBARR SYNNOTT

A Vocation of the Clergy

COLIN COLLINS

Response to the times

R. W. THUYS

Introduction to Existentialism

ROSE MOSS

Church and State—U.S.A.

TISSA BALASURIYA

World Apartheid

SISTER PIENTIA

Illustration

LETTERS

CHALLENGE

P.O. BOX 5015, JOHANNESBURG

SUBSCRIPTION: R1 p.a. (post free)

15 cents

Ut omnes unum sint

soliciting your vote only the Progressives will extend the franchise to all, subject to educational and/or property qualifications. There are many supporters of the Progressive Party, however, who have not accepted the corollary that, if you impose qualifications for the vote, you are obliged to ensure that all can achieve the necessary qualifications in the shortest possible time. The qualified franchise can be justified only as a means to an end—the full participation of all adults in the political life of the community. Our plight today makes clear that political rights are essential to the preservation and extension of other rights, and therefore the Christian voter has choice in the matter only between those parties whose policies include a specific commitment to universal adult suffrage (and 18 years is not adult in this respect), either immediately, as the Liberal Party proposes, or within a short period, as the Progressive policy necessitates, if this policy is implemented in all its implications.

What is there to say about the general election? As Father Synnott says in an article in this issue, the possession of the vote in South Africa is a fearsome moral responsibility. Change there must be and change there will be: in our own lifetime it will be possible to look back on the relatively short period of Afrikaner Nationalist domination as the most concentrated period of disaster in our history. But will this be seen through the distorting filter of an outburst of violence and destruction or through an essentially useful process of adjustment but by no means painless redistribution of wealth and power?

The general election is unlikely to change for the better the disposition of political power in the country one iota: the onslaught on the rights of the individual will continue and the abuse of the political power for reform will increase. The election offers only an imperfect opportunity to exercise your obligation to express your belief in the value of democratic processes. We cannot say to all our enfranchised readers that you have a moral obligation to vote because we do not believe that in most constituencies there is a choice between a moral policy and an immoral one—there is often merely a choice between a clearly immoral policy (in the Nationalist Party) and a less clearly immoral policy (in the United Party). All we can say is that you are obliged, morally, to take part in political activity in such a way as to ensure that in future elections you and all your fellow South Africans will have a true choice of moral policies. It is of no use to will the end, a just society, and to refuse to will the means, political parties with just policies. You cannot opt out of politics,

nor can you deny others the right and duty to participate. ●

challenge

(every second month)

SUBSCRIPTION FORM
P.O. Box 5015 Johannesburg

Please write in block letters

Please enrol me as a subscriber/renew my subscription from the
issue

Name

Address

I enclose cheque/postal order/note for R1 00

If we can find 60 people who are willing to contribute regularly, by stop-order, no more than R2 each per month, CHALLENGE will be able to meet its financial commitments. Such readers will automatically receive copies of CHALLENGE without further subscription, and will receive each year public acknowledgement in CHALLENGE of their status as supporters of the magazine.

For practical reasons, such support should be by stop-order, payable monthly or quarterly, and stop-orders, of course, may be cancelled at any time. Stop-orders should be made payable to CHALLENGE and sent direct to us or to the Standard Bank, Fox Street Branch, Johannesburg. If the number of supporters exceeds 60 it will become possible to consider sending CHALLENGE to a much wider circle of readers, without insisting on payment. Ordinary subscriptions will continue to provide part of our income, as will cash sales of individual copies, but we hope that the method of raising funds we suggest will allow us to expand both our coverage and our readership.

Finbarr Synnott

A Vocation of the Clergy

I AM ONLY GOING TO make a short apology for concentrating on one social question in South Africa: that of Race. All our other social questions have become entirely secondary to this. It is known that South African economics could expand at much more than their present pace if a normal economic policy of using all available labour to its best were pursued. Every personal social relationship is conditioned by the consideration of colour. Legislation is all framed in terms of colour, and political parties divided in relation to colour policy. By this concentration South Africa has missed the main social crisis of the twentieth century world: that with Socialism, which has transformed the social life of Europe and split the world into two military camps. Colour questions predominate over everything. The quite extraordinary concentration of our Bishops' Joint Pastorals on this one subject mark the Church's acceptance that this is not a problem but *the* problem of moral justice in South Africa's social structure.

In this paper also I am going to consider only the chief racial confrontation of South Africa: of African with European. The position of the Coloured people is unclear. It is not clear whether the meaning of the present policy is or is not to absorb them into one system with the white group, in spite of existing segregation laws. But as the main 'middle people' in South Africa there is little doubt that they could be a great, and possibly the chief, determining force in its adjustment to colour problems, a point of meeting and understanding for black and white alike.

The same applies in degree to the much less numerous Asiatics. In both spheres there is a vocation similar to that offered to white and black by the South African dilemma.

There will be only three chief points in this paper. But it seems to me they are all of extreme importance, and the very type of matter that most easily gets overlooked in a period of heated controversy such as exists here in the matter of racial justice.

The *first* is that South Africa is at present unique in the world in the particular form of its social problem.

The *second* is that this problem is essentially a moral problem, and hence an awareness and a line of study is required for all South African clergy that is not required of others. The *third* is that this problem is so great that the chief thing is not so much to find the answer, but to get ourselves into a state of mind in which we are prepared to hear the answer when the meaning of God in our situation becomes clear.

I do not think the first point needs very much elaboration. South Africa is the only case left of a large block of white people imposing their rule upon a larger subject population of different colour, and refusing the latter participation in the government and economic opportunities of the country. Mozambique and Rhodesia are different: Rhodesia because the whites are so few that they know it is only a matter of time until Africans have normal citizen rights; Mozambique for a similar reason, and also because the colour-bar is quite a different thing there. There is no *law* in Mozambique to prevent an African who works hard enough owing a mine or large farm, becoming Governor or even President of the Portuguese Union. It is only a matter of pace, not of legal prohibition. Colonialism has developed, or is developing so quickly elsewhere, in the East, in French and British Africa, etc. . . . that we can say it is finished. But in South Africa we have a different phenomenon.

Here we have a group of whites so numerous and powerful that they have every prospect of being able to hold on for an indefinite time. They have a strategic hold on the countries which criticise them by the possession of the chief single Gold supply of the western world, by immense investments from England, America, Europe, and now even from Japan, which these countries will not want to see lost in a social upheaval. The wealth of the country gives the whites who hold it a technological and military power capable of resisting the whole of Africa. An attack from the East would mean the attacker being involved with America in world war. Internally, police military and the immense technical resources are so closely linked in the hands of the whites only, and in support of the status quo, that there is an assured security for many years to come

All this power to resist change is moreover in the hands of a moral force of a different calibre from ordinary colonial institutions. The Englishman, Frenchman or Portuguese can go home to a country that has his own language and feeling and type of humanity, if he does not like to live in an African majority state. But the majority of South African whites are white Africans, with a new language not spoken elsewhere in the world, with three hundred years of tradition as a people not of Europe but of Africa, and to disappear into an African majority state means for their stock, or type, to disappear from the face of the earth. What is honour and economic advantage to the other colonials, is survival to the Afrikaner. Moreover, in this type has been found not only the most tenacious refusal to mix with Africans, but a 'mystique' of their vocation as a people that has become essentially religious, resisting outside influences with the conviction of a prophet. It is a unique social situation in the twentieth century.

A special responsibility of the clergy in such a matter as this can enter if it becomes essentially moral matter, not matter only of political alternatives that are morally indifferent, as is so often the case in ordinary political life. Is the question of the present system in racial relations in South Africa such a matter? Is there reason for thinking there is something seriously wrong morally in the whole thing, which affects not only the immediate conduct of each Christian in his relations with other people, but makes it a question whether he can, as a voter, support the system without sin?

I wish to offer no solutions of South Africa's problems here. In fact I am glad that, whatever my own convictions, it would be impossible even to begin to get them across in so short a space. For if South African affairs could be tidied up in a brief formula one of the chief conclusions of this paper would go. It will be that, so serious are any of the alternatives before the country, no man will be able to come to grips with the perseverance and faith required, unless he has built up conviction in himself by real deep personal study and prayer about the matter.

ESSENTIALLY MORAL QUESTION

But what can be done here is to show that there is a clear argument for the Race Question in South Africa being an essentially moral one, and for it involving very serious matter.

First of all we have the overall fact, which must be quite astonishing in the history of Bishops and their habits, that of the four successive joint pastorals issued to the country by the Conference of Catholic Bishops, three were exclusively on this matter, in 1952, 1957, and

1960, and the fourth, in 1962, while being more generally on the Church, concentrated the whole question of charity, which is the life of the Church, particularly on this one matter of Race Relations. The Bishops, as our moral guides, have felt the obligation to set this forth as a supreme challenge to charity in South Africa and so almost as a test of Christianity. Unless the matter was of moral significance and of the most extraordinary kind, they could not so have concentrated the focus of attention in the Christian life so much on one matter.

CHRISTIAN CONDEMNATION

Then there is the matter of condemnation by Christians of other countries. We may say they do not know the whole circumstances. This is what is said all the time. But we should remember also that 'no one is a judge in his own case'. White South Africans, with their emotions so intensely involved, with so much to lose by change, are of the nature of the case unlikely to be able to reach an impartial judgment. Nor do I mean this only as an accusation of selfishness. I mean, for instance, in their anxiety about the future of their children. They cannot help favouring their own. This is why Natural Law, i.e. of God, provides us with courts and arbitration to judge between two whose judgment is confused by their own interests. If you regard South Africa as a conflict between the interests, or better still the rights, of two peoples, it becomes axiomatic that outsiders are better able to judge than the whites, who now alone vote and choose—or the black, who, is not now permitted to do either. If you regard it as a 'parental' relationship in which white must judge for both (whatever the justification for such an attitude might be) still the Natural Law does not leave it to parents to judge when their child will come of age. It is fixed by law as an outside arbitrator, otherwise many parents would not relinquish authority in time. If the whole of the rest of the Christian world thinks we are wrong, and condemns what is here done as by a Christian state, there is here another reason for thinking there really is something very seriously wrong.

I have used a very strong word in this context, 'condemnation'. It is important to use the word, because it represents the fact. This is a common attitude of Christians overseas to our racial problems. But while there is the fact that they condemn, and it is a part of the grounds for seeing that there is something very deeply wrong in South Africa, there is a really serious misunderstanding of the human situation. The present generation of white South Africans have no less Christian virtue than those overseas who thus criticise them. The difference is only that to achieve an ele-

mentary justice in their social organisation makes demands upon them which are unknown in the political life of countries such as Holland and England. They have been born and brought up to expect a position of privilege, and to a certain characteristically European way of life and very high standards of living, all of which must inevitably change if the wealth of the country is more justly shared and it passes into the control of an African majority. They have been brought up in the Anglo-Dutch colour-bar tradition, and in the general social framework of a form of culture which tended to identify religion with the genius and particular culture of different nations, in a way not found in the Catholic colonial powers, France, Spain or Portugal. They are suddenly asked to correct within a few years, the mistakes made in this tradition over three centuries of bitter struggle. They are asked to renounce what they have seen as their birthright, as no Englishman or Frenchman is when he votes about his country's social system. They have the added *misfortune* of great power and wealth, and cannot be forced by sheer weakness to give way, as has occurred so much in British Africa. It is unknown in the history of the world for any privileged people to vote away their privileges without pressure, by mere moral choice. If the present generation of white South Africans cannot rise to this quickly, it in no way proves they are worse people than their counterparts in England, France or America, only that they have a demand upon them the latter in their homogeneous countries have not.

CONVERSION NECESSARY

It is this that is misunderstood overseas. It is the implied accusation of wickedness which the South African white knows to be unjust that confuses the issue. While the testimony of the Catholic Bishops of this country upholds that the criticism of the *objective facts* of our racial policies overseas is justified, the extraordinary demand of a change of way of life, amounting to a conversion, now placed upon the white South African, is in no way realised.

We might compare this to the conversion of a good pagan, who has been really good, and yet has several wives to whom he is deeply loyal. He suddenly discovers that he must renounce a whole way of living and in a way penalise those whom he has taught to expect certain advantages from him. If he fails to rise to this the Church treats him very gently but firmly. He must not immediately be told he is wicked to refuse, for he has acted in good conscience and is aware of it, and to accuse him of wickedness will only anger and alienate him. But now that he knows, however hard it may be,

he must be told his duty. We can neither diminish the truth, nor accuse of evil will those who have not known it. We can know that if they fail to rise to a demand that may be almost one of heroic virtue, God will know their difficulties. This cannot release us from the duty of teaching the truth, but it obliges us to an extraordinary care and sympathy in doing so, considering the quite extraordinary and unexpected demands to be made upon the man who hears it.

It seems to me it is something of this understanding, not assessment of objective justice of the situation, that is principally lacking in outside criticism of South Africa. We, who know it all, must take guard. There is no use simply vituperating people who know they are not bad people, when they fail to rise to some great demand made upon them by providence—which is the true name for history. We must place it in terms of vocation, not condemnation. We must not fail to show the duty, but must do so with a treble sympathy.

I think this longish digression is necessary to show how overseas criticism, while failing in sympathy, can from the vantage point of the outside observer be right in objective fact, and an argument for there being a state of quite extraordinary social injustice in South Africa.

Now let us take an argument internal to the situation. I want to take a point more centrally and obviously ethical than many other questions of rights, about which there could be more argument. It also brings out my point of the obligation of study on the South African clergy and implies that they may need to know social statistics and forces as the clergy of other countries need not.

MIGRATORY LABOUR

There is in the Republic a labour force of about two and a half million African men. Whatever may happen in development of Reserves, these are here to stay. They are nearly the total of the heavy labour force, and nearly 60% of the total of men working in the country. No one suggests that the existing industries, mines, farms, railways, etc., are all to be moved to the reserves. Nor are Europeans going to emigrate from Europe to this country to do the kind of work Africans are doing at rates of pay similar to theirs. The work-force of the Republic is here to stay, for any foreseeable future. It can no more be sent away than the labour population of any other country.

Under South African law about one million of this work-force of African men are migratory. That is to say they are not allowed to have their families near their work, but must leave them in distant territories while they come to work, only see them for a few

months of the year, as in mine contract labour, or for a few weeks, in many cases of their industrial or domestic or contract work. More than half of these are already married. South Africa, claiming Christian laws, forbids family life to nearly half of its African male labour force. The results are known: a giant system of immorality and prostitution, unnatural vice in the compounds, children growing with their father a stranger, women in the Reserves unable to control their growing children; temptations, loneliness, social and moral despair.

Now this is not an adjunct to the system. It is the system. Were it not imposed the urban areas of South Africa would rapidly double or treble their present African population; with settlement would go social development in skills and political consciousness; the whole system would collapse. Those who hailed the Bantu Laws Amendment Act as reinforcing this system as the key to South African social formation were right. It is the key. But the South African Bishops' statement of 1964 called it the 'negation of social morality' since it destroys the family. Let anyone look into it, not take this sketch of mine, and he will find it so. The same could be done with all our other many Colour-bar laws and their application.

This is a matter of Morals. You cannot vote to abolish ordinary family life, for a large part of the population and for an unforeseeable period in the future. It has now been going on for three generations since the development of the mines and the Union. It is not just the work of one party. It is the South African system, which has hardly varied, in spite of the different terminology used, in fifty years.

ONE'S VOTE ONE'S RESPONSIBILITY

If this is correct it follows that there is an immoral element in the South African social system involving every person who supports it, i.e. every voter. It is not a matter of shades of difference about industry or foreign policy such as divides parties in England or America. It is a matter of voting in such a way that absolute questions of justice, in gravest matter are involved. It is a matter in which to accept conventions in society easily may involve sin against essential charity in Christ. It makes the possession of a vote in South Africa a fearsome moral responsibility.

Now it does not follow that it is the duty of the clergy to get up in the pulpit and tell the people how to vote. But it does follow that, since it is moral matter, it is the clergy's duty, for the sake of charity and the good name of Christ, to press the people to a study of it as serious as they would give to other matters where

a continuance in grave sin would be involved. Moral direction consists not only in stating principles, but in indicating the circumstances that bring these principles into contact with reality. The more serious the matter, and the more circumstantially complicated, the more serious the obligation of study.

JUSTICE OR SIN

So we come to the second conclusion. It is necessary for the South African clergy to have a special knowledge not only of the Church's teaching on social justice, and racial justice, in depth, but even a knowledge of social statistics, and of circumstances, of the actual effect of civil law, such as is not necessary to other clergies. Everybody knows that all laws hit some people hard. It may only be discovered by knowledge of social statistics when a law does injustice to so many that the common good is destroyed and it is an evil law. Every country, for instance, has soldiers called up and sailors at sea who have to be much away from their families. But it is quite different if, as the example given above will show when studied nearly half the main labour force of a country is by law forbidden normal family life.

The essential need of such application by the clergy to this matter exists because it is here and now matter of justice or sin. But there is an added reason of mercy, to the African who suffers now, and to the white child growing up. The latter is being brought up in a false paradise, to expect a situation of privilege impossible to the ideas of the twentieth century. Nor is there any evidence of a political force in the country likely to bring about this change. Here again social study is necessary. It will show if I am not mistaken in this case that the voting of the white in South Africa has moved rather in favour of the status quo than of change in the last fifteen years.

There are those who hold that economic pressures will bring about the change. As industry grows Africans will reach a position of economic strength in which they can force it. This may be true, but yet disastrous. For if they reach such a position before the Whites are morally prepared to give way, it may only precipitate trouble rather than cause peace, leave things worse than better. John XXIII has emphasised, in *Pacem in Terris*, that social reform to be lasting and true must be voluntary, from conviction and free will. It is a Marxist idea, not a Christian one, to leave social reform to economic pressures, and goes along with the idea of the inevitability, and so the virtue, of revolution. We can and must use the economic force, but if we allow it to take over without moral control we must expect

not human relations but the clash of blind forces.

Since it is the Whites who establish the South African system the first obligation of study to meet the crisis falls upon the priests preaching to them. They need it the more since, except as employers of domestics, they come into contact with Africans so rarely, and simply do not know the impact of the laws upon them. Being deeply involved with their white Christians they find it hard to visualise these good people doing major injustice even by ignorance and involuntarily. We are all human, and our minds rarely give their best until our feelings are deeply involved. The priest working with Whites needs as a rule a deliberate effort to place himself in the position where, as Pope John has so charmingly said, his heart beats with the heart of the other, i.e. to experience what South Africa is like for an African.

AFRICAN CLERGY

Such study is not only necessary, however, to those who preach to Whites. It must be felt as a duty to the African clergy also, who might neglect it for some reasons. These I have experienced myself in preaching for many years to Africans. The first is a kind of natural distaste for preaching matter of social rights that might seem an invitation to listen to the Gospel because it will bring social advantage, rather than the cross and patience of Christ, to the hearers. The second is at the opposite extreme, and may perhaps be felt more by a white priest preaching to Africans than by Africans preaching to Africans. It is the difficulty of asking people to be patient when you are not yourself suffering the disadvantages they suffer. African priests will feel the disabilities of Africans well enough. But a sort of tiredness about the whole business, and a feeling it is better just to get on preaching the Gospel, may cause them to show insufficient interest in these matters of justice which are necessary to the good name of the Church among their people. The latter must know where the Church stands. So while there may be a different reason for study the African clergy have equally a special duty in South Africa which does not fall in the same way on priests in a more normal social situation.

For both clergies this study will entail one particular form of application that is not at all easy. It is to see the boundaries between what is essential morality and what is legitimate political difference within the moral law; the difference between giving the lead in obtaining the knowledge of social circumstances necessary for moral judgment, and entering directly into the political applications which are matter of the individual's judg-

ment. One of the sad things about the Catholic newspaper commentary in many places is that it goes into political matters which are largely indifferent morally, and yet does not firmly preach the social doctrine of the encyclicals of the Popes. It is particularly necessary in countries where the Afrikaans-English tradition of the clergy keeping out of politics is so strong. If we wish to speak as moralists, it must be on demonstrably moral matter.

South African Europeans instinctively realise that the country cannot go on as it is now. They are worried in their conscience. They live in fear, for they know that for one people to hold another more numerous people as a work-force without civil rights is not likely to last in the twentieth century. But the true alternatives before the country are so hard for them to face that those who voluntarily face them are a minute minority.

PARTITION OR MIXED SOCIETY

As anyone who is willing to study the facts will find, the country cannot exist without the labour force of the mines, farms and industries. Either therefore, there must be a partition, in which a large part of the country, including much of its land, main industries and large towns, must be handed to the Africans, while the Whites move into a smaller area that they can work with their own labour; or those who work in the Republic must be given citizen rights in it in a multi-racial state with an inevitable progress towards a mixed society. There can be no permanent third settlement visible in ordinary human judgment, and to pretend it is to preach smooth sayings. Moreover, at the pace at which things move in the twentieth century, the decisive step will have to be taken in a short time.

Each of these solutions is so staggering to the South African European that no politician can put it before the people and get votes. For in either case it entails a vast renunciation of land and wealth, status and privilege.

So we come to my third main conclusion. I will not attempt to ask here which of these alternatives is better, nor even whether the partition idea is compatible with the doctrine given in the Joint Pastorals of the Catholic Bishops. I wish only to use both alternatives to stress that *someone* has got to create a complete change of outlook in the European group. His principle problem will be to get them into a state of mental preparation to accept such a formidable choice, to be ready for a change comparable to conversion, for a renunciation of much they consider their birthright, for such sacrifices as are commonly only required of men in wartime.

Since the matter is moral, and since no other force is visible to produce the necessary change, this someone must be the clergy, the Christian ministry. It may be a very high and special vocation, and a most blessed and happy one, for those called to guide as for those called to act.

In wartime, for the sake of the common good, humanity can put on an entirely new generosity and a new emotional system also. People will accept taxation of all but a small part of their income, leave their family business and career, cheerfully risk death—and all this even if up to date they have lived flat and selfish lives. To fulfil the needs of justice now, and to provide a tolerable inheritance for his children, the South African European is called to a similar degree of generosity. It is not his fault that the birthright he saw was a delusion. It is only that accidents or providence of history have left him with a peculiar problem that others have not. He should not rail at this. Just as those who have to go to war for their country, while others are comfortable and in peace in other countries, do not say 'Why me?', but are rather proud of their vocation to renunciation, so he might be brought to see it. He can show the world something new in human generosity and social relations.

MORAL CAMPAIGN

This is crisis talk. But it is crisis matter. To hand over half the country, or to accept a mixed state; to do one or other within, say, at most fifteen years, this is crisis talk.

A moral campaign must begin commonly in the opposite way to a political campaign. Not plans first, but prayer and action first. Not a formula that all will immediately be able to accept, but the true formula even if only a very few will accept it, and so move others to see its possibility and its gift of happiness. No one can wait for anyone else. The partitionists ought to be ready for sending away their African servants, taking work on 'the lowest levels' of heavy manual labour and domestic work, offering their farm first to be sold for the partition plan (not suggesting somebody else's district) accepting impoverishment, or if it does not immediately come, using for themselves only a portion of the income that they must necessarily find reduced in the full scheme. The Integrationists ought to act likewise about their income—first proof of conviction. They ought to offer to work with Africans on the same level, or under them if they are better qualified in their job. They ought to suggest their street first (not somebody else's) for occupation of houses by Africans who can afford it. They ought to work openly in favour of votes for Africans, and for African members of Parliament. Both should be prepared to carry their crusade

to the extent of risking ostracism and even disgrace, for it is part of the Gospel of justice and charity.

A moral force such as this is the only one that can save South Africa. If it sounds fantastic it must also have sounded fantastic to a few poor Hebrews to be told to go and convert the world. There can be no guarantee of success, only the certainty that the name of Christ must be shown truly, and the rest left to Him.

An equally unusual difficulty faces the African, and so the African clergy preaching to their own, and so an equal vocation in the matter. It is to forestall and prevent hatred, somehow to instil into their people that, although John XXIII says it is their duty to vindicate their rights, it is equally their duty to give the bewildered European time—reasonable time—to make the great change that must come in him. It is to form lay people so knowledgeable in justice, so forceful in their own justice and self sacrifice, that they may be listened to when they speak in this sense. The African here may reasonably have to wait a little longer than his brother farther north for full citizen rights. Providence has permitted him to be involved, along with his European brother, in the strange problem or vocation of South Africa. If one has to make a great sacrifice, the other should be ready to take his share.

'Christ in the garden of olives' writes Fr. von Balthasar, 'shows us the basic Christian experience of being asked for *more* than is possible.'

SPECIFIC TASKS

Clearly the clergy must begin by giving themselves a burden similar to that which it seems the laypeople must be asked to take. This means first study, hours and hours of study, months and years of study, not just of newspaper accounts of South Africa, but of documents of the social doctrine of the Church on the one hand, and of the largely hidden facts of the present South African social situation. It is necessary for the clergy working for Whites to get to know something of the way of life of others in a manner that can make them feel, not only the direct sympathy they feel for the few non-Whites they come into contact with, but an experience of the impact of the whole system of law on the whole people. It is necessary for those working with non-Europeans to avoid a certain form of zest in being the priest for the underdog (which we all inevitably feel), to feel sympathy with the Whites, and yet to allow neither this, nor a despair about the magnitude of the whole thing, to prevent constructive study, thinking and action. For both it seems that the most important thing is that an unavoidable distinction of work should not grow into a mental distance and fundamental disagreement

between the two clergies. There is in a way more danger of this in South Africa that there is between the clergies of two nations at war, where the matter is clearer. The more zealous a priest is the more he tends to identify himself wholly with the people for whom he works, and

it is the danger of the priesthood of South Africa that the situation so absolutely cuts off the two peoples from each other that it is superhumanly difficult, 'more than is possible', for priests working one side of the colour-bar to be fully identified with those on the other. ●

Colin Collins

Response to the times

IT IS EVIDENT THAT deep changes in attitudes within the Christian Churches are taking place. Perhaps one of the main reasons for these far-reaching changes is the fact that the world in which we live is very different from the world of, say, a century ago. An examination of Christianity's response to the times may well reveal not only some of the causes for the changes in Christianity, but also give some indications of the Christianity of the future.

The question of how, or why or whether Christianity should respond to the times could be approached from various points of view. It could be established as a theological principle; others could argue that it is a moral imperative; others, again, could argue for response as being a historical necessity, while others yet might simply state that Christianity's response to the times is a sociological reality. Perhaps the two entirely opposite points of view concerning response to the times would be either that it is a moral responsibility (which is rarely done) or that it is a rather dubious compromise with the modern world (which is perhaps done more often).

Because the writer is neither a theologian, nor a historian, nor a sociologist, a rather broad and amateurish description will be given.

A presumption is that Christianity has in fact a responsibility to the times (at least because Christians are people living *now*), and that Christianity has until now responded in an inadequate fashion to the modern world. Perhaps the main reason for this latter position is the trend within the Church to ignore the 'world'.

A superficial reading of the New Testament might lead the amateur to think that Christ possibly and St. Paul probably, had a grudge against the 'world'. The world of physical reality and the world of wrongdoing are concepts that are not easily distinguishable by someone not versed in Semitic ways of thought. Hence a definite impression that world is to be avoided

and the next world is to be preferred is inevitable. The impression created is that God in His transcendence is the only reality; that the life we know is shadowy and insecure; and that faith and obedience to the law are all that matters.

This belief—a genuine one—was taken up for fairly obvious historical reasons in the early Christian years. It was repeated in the lives of the hermits and monks who fled from the world to live other-worldly lives. It was to a good extent emphasized in the devotions of the people during the Middle Ages. The Church was a Citadel and a Fortress. Christians might have to indulge in secular occupations, but the emphasis in prayer and even in art was that the world was to be passed through as something evil or at least tainted.

This other-worldly stress made the Church more and more incompatible with the world after the Renaissance and Reformation. Salvation of the individual became one of the central thoughts; a defence mentality was particularly in evidence and the Church virtually withdrew into an ivory tower scarcely related to the reality of the evolving modern society and rather inept in its message to it.

The world in which we live is so varied today that it would be difficult to describe it adequately. From the Christian point of view, however, perhaps the most important factor is that most of the Western world and those affected by it have, in the main, withdrawn from conventional Christianity. (As someone once said: 'Western society lost its Church in the Reformation, its Faith in the Age of Enlightenment, and its head in the 20th Century'.) The other dominant characteristic of the modern world is, of course, the fact that primarily through machines, the world is rapidly becoming a man-made world.

Man's departure from religion has ushered in the age of secularization. The majority of people are no longer passionately for or against religion. They simply

have nothing to say for or against it. We are living in an age of non-religion (taking religion to mean set ecclesiastical forms). Particularly within Western society, active Christianity is rapidly ceasing to be the religious expression, the religious mood and feeling of society. 'God is dead' is the oft-repeated cry and Christ has become a legendary figure.

It is interesting to note that because of this tendency a return to fundamentalism is being made, very often by less educated people, and theologically educated people are attempting to build up a theology of the secular (religion without God?).

Closely allied to the secularization is industrialization, or rather man's attempt to build a world of his own. If we are to believe the sometimes romantic visions given us by science fiction writers, then perhaps in our lifetime a whiff of fresh air or a swim in the sea may well become abnormal. Man is becoming surrounded by his own constructions and will, perhaps, soon have very little contact with natural realities. Today man's personality ranges not only over the earth but beyond it. For the first time, as the Abbe Breuil put it, man is moving out of the neolithic age and, as the prophets of doom were saying twenty years ago: 'a new society is going to be depersonalized, subject to the machine's control (and perhaps even ruled by computers!)'.

In such an age, people who are no longer religious are finding values never completely realized in the Churches. Those inclined towards religion, are seeing the world in terms of a new vision. Perhaps Teilhard de Chardin in his *Phenomenon of Man* is one of the products of this 'secular-religious' vision of reality.

RESPONSE TO THE TIMES

As yet it is extremely difficult to speak in anything but vague terms concerning Christianity's response to the times. The Vatican Council has perhaps moved the Church a couple of centuries closer to our times, but naturally enough, has done so cautiously. Some elements of this response may be mentioned.

Firstly, there are those elements that are concerned with the vertical line of human responsibility, namely the God-man response. Within this category three points may be mentioned:

(1) There is a growing awareness of the necessity for stillness. By stillness is meant contemplation and meditation. Today such prayer is being seen as the prerequisite to practically every attitude. In prayer, eastern techniques are frequently being used and the more activist western approach is falling into disuse.

- (2) There is a particular response of faith within the modern context. To over-simplify, this is perhaps no longer faith in a system or even in a Church, but in the concrete acceptance of the Resurrected Christ. (This was described in the second article of this series). New vigour in this regard may well bring new understanding to the crucial problem of death, instead of Christianity's sometime sentimental attitude.
- (3) The average Christian today also has an almost religious faith in reality. He accepts the things around him as they stand. He sees quite clearly the society in which he moves and has contact with people, being no longer prejudiced by 'I want to convert you' feelings. Within this context there are moves towards what some people call a theology of the secular. To put an incongruous sort of group together, I understand that Bultmann, Bonhoeffer and even Simone Weil were people of such understanding.

SERVICE TO THE WORLD

Other than man's vertical response to God, he is also in relation to reality and the people round about himself. He is coming round to the fact that he has to be of service to the world. People have come to realize that such services are performed in the main by being competent scientists, sociologists or whatever the case may be. It does not pay to moralise about aspects of life. What is of value is that one serves immediate reality in truth and humility.

The new vision within Christianity is a vision of society based on the value of the person and that relationship between people known as love. Three examples of such attempts will suffice:

- (1) The Christian vision of a family is today much more realistic and in harmony with life in the modern world. Marriage is no longer viewed as a biological union for the production of children, but as a genuine uniting of intricate personalities. The theology of marriage is becoming a far more worldly one and sex is finding its rightful place in Christian thinking.
- (2) In the field of education, both religious and secular, Christianity is undergoing enormous changes. For example, religious education is not being seen today as the positing of a series of propositions to the untutored mind, but rather as being an attempt to arouse faith and keep contact with faith. Specifically Church education is also more and more falling into disfavour.
- (3) Perhaps the most significant feature of Christian

thinking today is its growth towards the idea of unity. In modern society mechanization in all its forms is drawing the world into a single history and a single shape. The closer this unity, the more demands there will be on the individual, rather than on the group. True unity is reflected by the unifying process that should be found in marriage; the greater the love that draws two people together the more each person is perfected as an individual. This parallel growth of unity and individuality is perhaps the most important element of our world and it is rapidly becoming evident in every sphere of life. Only the misguided or ignorant can ignore this.

The Christianity of today is therefore seeing in a new

light the unity of the world in Christ. Socially speaking, Christianity may well rise or fall in proportion to its ability to knock down barriers and obstacles between peoples and to subdue hates and prejudices.

Once more in this context de Chardin's vision is significant. All things were initiated in Christ and historically will end in Him. Christ is the Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the end, Christ now and forever. Perhaps one does not have to be as optimistic as de Chardin in seeing the whole of both human and physical reality in a constant state of evolution towards Christ, the Omega point. But certainly one would be foolish to deny that humanity in becoming one is moving forward, and in moving forward is becoming more one. ●

R. W. Thuys

Introduction to Existentialism

THE PHILOSOPHY OF Existentialism is associated particularly with the work of Jean-Paul Sartre, who used the term *Existentialism* to characterise his humanistic philosophy. His followers made this philosophy of life fashionable by the manner in which they tried to express it in their daily existence. They were the well-known bearded young men, who in the years after the war were commonly to be seen in the Cafés of St. Germain de Prés.

On account of this popularization and the expressly pessimistic and atheistic attitude adopted by Sartre's disciples, other French philosophers refused to be called existentialists. Nevertheless the term has gradually been accepted and indicates today a modern trend to return to the concrete, changeable reality of experience and to question the validity of abstract philosophical analyses of human existence. This represents a reaction against rationalism, with its tendency to think in terms of abstract essences and unchangeable concepts.

The defining characteristic of this *existentialism* is its view of the nature of man. Man is not just one of the many beings found on this earth, and thus a "thing" among other things, (even though endowed with reason and freewill), but rather he is a being who takes a privileged position among other existing things, so that they all point to him as the one who determines their sense

and being. Man is not fixed as a thing, as an immutable essence, but rather he is in himself nothing else but a possibility, which only comes to realization through his free projection of himself in the rôle of man.

Certainly, man stands in actual life in the midst of several determinants, such as: social environment, origin, heredity, biological structure, etc., but these do not affect him fundamentally. What he really is, as man, depends on the attitude he adopts towards them, and the manner in which he assimilates them freely within the many possibilities of his own being. Man is what he makes of himself.

From this it follows that there are only two modes of existence for man. He can remain passive and allow himself to be determined by the world in which he is placed. This is called the non-authentic mode of existence, because man thus makes himself more or less a thing. Alternatively, he can take up his own existence, and, in freedom, choose his attitude towards it. He thus creates for himself the world in which he desires to live, projects his own sense of what the world will mean for him. This is the true authentic mode of existence.

Even the non-authentic mode of existence remains human, in so far as man does not altogether become a thing. Hence the possibility remains open to him to cut himself adrift from this estrangement and return

to the fundamental freedom of an authentic existence.

Thus existentialism defines man's being as 'being-in-the-world'. Man is not a being-in-itself, a self-sufficient entity, which is placed for some time in this world. Rather his whole being consists in being directed to the world, in the projecting of his world. In so doing, things become his instruments and his fellow-beings, his co-existents. Being man is inseparably connected with the world. 'World' does not mean here, the cosmos or the earth; but a characteristic feature of human existence—the expression, the incarnation, of man's projecting of himself into a specific human living-space. Existence is then truly ex-istence, a standing-out, a standing open to the world. Thus are things enabled to stand out in the starkness of their individuality against the horizon of the world.

In so far as one meets one's fellow-man in this engagement with the world, this being, this man, becomes a 'Mitsein', a co-existence, a being-with. This

means that man can only come to be himself, to be a person, by standing open towards 'the other', by respecting his being man, his freedom, and by responding to his appeal. The French philosophers, in particular, have worked out more fully than the German, Heidegger, this aspect of co-existence, of being-with.

In this perspective, man is no longer seen as a being that consists of a distinct 'body' and 'soul', of 'spirit' and 'matter', in which the body or matter would be the means by which the conscious 'I' establishes contact with the material world. The existentialist tries to transcend this dualistic conception of man, to a true unity of being in which the corporal is the revelation, the realisation of the inner person.

It is perhaps no exaggeration to say that these fundamental premises are the basis of most modern philosophy, although individual philosophers differ widely in their working it out. ●

Rose Moss

Church and State—U.S.A.

IN SOUTH AFRICA the church is often told to keep out of politics. In the United States it has intervened fairly prominently in politics during the last few years. This is something of a paradox: while the policy of the South African government is repeatedly described by that government as Christian and National, implying that there can be a valid fusion of church and state interests in government, in the United States the Constitution expressly forbids such fusion and enjoins separation.

One of the most significant areas of the recent interaction of church and state in America has been in the civil rights movement in which many of the leaders have been explicitly Christian, have expressed their goals in Christian terms, have rallied the support of ministers of all denominations from the whole country, and have gained success in the enactment of civil rights legislation through the effect on public opinion of such incidents as the death of Reverend Reeb, a Boston minister who had come to Selma to assist, at the appeal of civil rights leaders, in demonstrations against restrictions on negro voting.

There have been other significant meetings of church

and state in recent years. There was the election of a Catholic to the White House and the surprising absence of politically directed religious bigotry which might have been expected during his campaign. There has been the Supreme Court decision banning prayers in state schools. More recently there has been the decision that a Connecticut law forbidding the practice and propagation of contraception was unconstitutional. But in the main these issues have defined the boundaries of power for state and church rather than effected any significant change in either.

But the civil rights movement has marshalled religious and political energy towards the same end; there has been an interaction rather than a definition of mutual boundaries; moral and religious considerations have overpowered into political action and political involvement has coloured religious perception and behaviour. It is particularly the involvement of clerics and nuns in the civil rights movement which I think important in America, because in this matter they have been emblematic of all Christians, of the Church itself, even though there are still many Christians who do not support or approve of their action. I think the effect of

the involvement of clerics and nuns in political actions is likely to grow in the future because such involvement has been an enactment, almost a liturgical expression, of many drives in the present life of the Church.

FROM VATICAN TO SELMA

The sight of priests and nuns in the front lines during the march on Selma early last year would have been unimaginable a few years ago. A great deal within the Church must have changed to make such a sight possible. This change has come at the same time as, and in part as a result of, Vatican II. It is one of the many manifestations of a growth and life in the Church today which until recently seemed imprisoned or disguised in a carapace of late scholastic theology and philosophy, counter-reformation art and polemics, reactionary politics and increments of national tradition, apathy and superstition which, being necessarily the fossils of local and temporary custom, seemed to bury the Church in the debris of her own history. So ossified, the Church's main communication with the world consisted of impotent assertions of power on her part and ignorant curiosity on the part of the world. Sometimes the world's curiosity was accompanied by resentment, sometimes by indifference, sometimes by ironic awe of the kind a living dinosaur might inspire. What respect there was for the modern Church was for matters which are peripheral to her essential life—the efficiency of the Vatican as a nerve centre of diplomatic activity, the *savoir vivre* of some of the clergy, the allegedly therapeutic psychological effects of the liturgy and confession.

But since one of the actually essential qualities of the Church's life is that it should be apostolic, there were, even in the bad old days, currents of Christ's life straining out of the carapace—in the ecumenical movement reaching out towards all Christians, and even, although weakly, to all believers; the liturgical movement reaching towards the modern world for forms and gestures in which the Church's life might be expressed and more deeply lived; the worker priest movement, Catholic Action, the Young Christian Workers, the Little Brothers and Sisters of Jesus, trying to meet the modern world in its own characteristic shapes and environments; and there were the largely disregarded social encyclicals which, in attempting to guide the modern world, had to learn something of its language and problems and such axiomatic precepts as that charity is no substitute for justice. And, of course, there was holiness in individuals and institutions which did not strain against the inherited weight of the Church.

Vatican II seems to have surprised even its participants by the vigour with which it has set aside the peripheral strengths of the Church which were, like crutches worn too long, sapping the very strength they were supposed to support. It has given a sanction few could have expected to many diverse attempts to reach out of the Church to the world, attempts which always involve a re-understanding of the Christian vocation in terms of new problems and new insights. It must be one of the factors which made it possible for priests and nuns to march to Selma.

ONWARD CHRISTIAN DEMONSTRATORS

What their marching implies is not only that Catholics may unite with other Christians towards a common Christian end, or that Catholics may unite with those who are not even Christians, not even Jews, not, often, even agnostics or atheists, but even with those to whom the whole matter of faith seems irrelevant. We have said for a long time that Christ, being the light of the world, has shone in the heart of every man, but for as long we have spoken as though we alone knew 'the truth' (as though 'the truth' could be divorced from all the particular truths which are not the prerogative of Catholics or believers but are matters of artistic, scientific, political and moral training and insight in which believers may, and often have, lagged). It means that those who took part in the march have had a living experience of the quality of other Christians (and Jews, and atheists, and beatniks, and others) which has strengthened the convictions with which they started, that the Church must move out to these people because it can learn from them and because the central, international life of the Church demands that she live in the world, among men, with the life of men. One of the sad paradoxes of the Church as we usually know it is that many of those most devoted to Christ, especially nuns and priests, have tried to turn away from the world He loved and came to save, and have been abetted in this attempt by the structures of the Church, by the nature of their vocations which cut them off from family life, by the structure of society which keeps them in respectable Catholic circles, among the pillars of the Church, rather than among the publicans and sinners (and, if one is to believe Southern white accusers of the civil rights leaders, the fornicators and embezzlers), and by the fear, as endemic among Christians as in the nominally Christian societies in which they may find themselves, the fear that they will really practise their revolutionary religion.

They met other Christians (and non-Christians, and non-believers) on the grounds of a common struggle for

justice, and in such a way that they implicitly confessed their equality with their co-marchers. This came as something of a shock because nuns and priests have for some time appeared to transcend, or in some other way to evade, the Aristotelean definition of man as a political animal. Paralleling the schema on the Church which has repudiated the notion that the clergy are above the laity, this action showed priests and nuns accepting their civic responsibilities and not merely as though they accepted their status as citizens of the city of this world as well as of the City of God, but as though the injunction to thirst for justice had made them look for justice even in the political city, as though the realization of justice on earth is necessary to the building up of the kingdom of heaven. Of course political justice is not the only justice, but surely it is as worthy a goal of Christian endeavour as making the nine first Fridays.

The demand for justice has turned on the Church itself. At least one bishop has been challenged for trying to undercut support for the civil rights movement in his diocese; the orders who run some Catholic colleges and universities have been questioned by lay men on their appointment of staff, salary policy and tendency to paternalistic rule. To an increasing extent American Catholics seem to feel that protest can, as in the civil rights movement, help to secure liberty.

CHARITY NO SUBSTITUTE FOR JUSTICE

Another implication of the participation of clerics in the civil rights movement is that they have recognized that Christian charity must develop more complex and sophisticated forms to be able to penetrate the complex structures of modern society. Although it is almost a century since *De Rerum Novarum* insisted that charity is no substitute for justice, Christian action has tended to focus on direct means of feeding the hungry and healing the sick, to the almost total exclusion of the often more effective social and political methods of seeing that the hungry, the weak, and the ignorant are given the means—decent jobs, housing, schools, opportunities—to feed and clothe themselves. Christian action has, as it were, focused on treatment when the patient is ill instead of the equivalents of preventative medicine. Charity working through the structures of society, as through the demands for full political rights for negroes, cannot and will not ever replace more direct expressions of charity. But it is a relief to see the social encyclicals and their concern for the structures and their penetration by Christian charity and concepts of justice given body.

I have been writing as though this is the first time

the Church has been involved in politics although this is manifestly untrue. The Crucifixion itself was impelled in part by political dynamics and the Church has always been a victim of the powers of this world, either when they persecuted her or, worse, when they seduced her into thinking that her temporal power increased her spiritual power. All too often the involvement of the Church in politics has treated the Church as though it were of this world as well as in it, as though the wealth of the Church were papal territories or taxes, or church lands and buildings, or Catholic schools, or the eviscerated right to practise Catholicism as long as that right was not taken to include the right to criticize the regime too strongly. This kind of meddling by the Church in politics is rightly suspect, even idolatrous. It has primarily been an activity of the princes of the Church, attempting to manipulate the world to serve their own or the Church's temporal interests, sometimes what might be taken to be Catholic interests when Catholics are regarded as a group in society, but rarely Catholic interests in the sense that the most urgent interests of Catholics should be justice and righteousness. It accounts for the tone of the little Catholic protest there was, in Nazi Germany, for example, where damage to church property excited about as much comment as inherent iniquity of the Nazi ideology and the atrocities involved in its implementation. In the civil rights movement Christians have been struggling for what they take to be justice rather than self-interest.

LITURGICAL DRAMA

I have also been writing as though the issues were black and white, as though the black old past has given way to the bright white future. Of course I simplify only to state those points I wish to make clearly, without getting involved in too many qualifications. Of course the Church of the past has not been absolutely corrupt. Of course the members of the civil rights movement are not absolutely right and good, their influence on the general life of the Church, even in America, is still, small and has been resisted. But the nuns in the front line of the march to Selma enacted a new liturgical drama, a new gesture, an expression of Christ in the world, in the flesh among sinners, looking for justice, not terrified into submission by temporal power, not turning away from the world in mistrust of its power over them, knowing that Christ has overcome this world, knowing that we must use the freedom of the children of God to increase the freedom of all the children of God. ●



—Sister Pientia

Tissa Balasuriya

World Apartheid

THOUGH IT IS NOW 20 years since the end of World War II and the establishment of the United Nations, the poor countries are still very poor, if not poorer, and the rich countries are richer. The poor countries are poor partly because of their own lack of effort and partly because of the legacy of colonialism and the advantages of the rich; the rich are richer partly because of their efforts, and partly because of the long-term capital build-up that the colonial system and investments permitted.

Yet the world as a whole has today the means of offering its population a decent standard of life—something that for a host of reasons is simply unavailable for much of mankind. This fact alone makes it necessary that a way be found which, within a reasonable period of time, say 25 to 30 years, will bring about a sufficient redistribution of wealth among nations, adequate development within the poor countries, and, at the same time, remove the humiliation-paternalism syndrome of the present receiver-donor relationship between the poor and rich countries. For this we should first develop principles of world justice in economic relations and endeavour to establish the political structures which would make the exigencies of justice a reality.

The current social thinking on these problems seems to be hamstrung by too great a respect for the concept of national sovereignty and too little regard for the rights of human beings. The problem is similar to the one facing individual states which have to cope with internal poverty without humiliating their citizens. The theory of social justice and the welfare state has grown around the idea that the poor should receive as a right the minimum required for a decent human existence. Our theory of international social justice must develop along similar lines.

A first principle: Every man has a right to life, and the world is given to all mankind to "increase and multiply and fill the earth . . ." There is a primary right of all mankind to obtain the means for a decent existence from the resources of the world. The rights of nations and other subdivisions of mankind are secondary. The principle of subsidiarity is still effective, but not to the point where human rights are made unrealizable.

Property within national frontiers has a function for the world common good. No nation may use its property to the detriment of the common good of the human race. Indeed, before luxuries are provided, the basic human needs of food, clothing and shelter must be met. There should be institutions at a world level that could bring about, as a matter of right, the redistribution of property to establish these priorities. If this basic (Christian) principle were accepted, one could think of solutions that over a period of time could meet, in terms of justice, the problems of poverty in the midst of plenty. It might be called a principle of *economic democracy*, which demands economic rights for all men and the end of a regime of monopolistic privileges in the economic field, especially when they are founded on and defended by force.

In this perspective, possible solutions might be discussed within two frameworks: (1) presupposing present national frontiers with the redistribution of money and movable resources; (2) adding the further possibility of redistribution of land and manpower.

Under the first hypothesis, the basic principle of redistribution should provide for each nation obtaining from the world society sufficiency of means to ensure a decent life for its citizens; in return receiver nations would give according to their means to the human society. The *terms of trade* would not be the result of respective bargaining powers; rather, like the wage contract within a nation, the trade contract would be subject to international regulations.

NATIONAL TAXES

Another solution might be for the United Nations to apply, on a progressive basis, a *national income tax* to nations and redistribute accordingly. This would avoid the unhappy subservience of aid to ideological loyalties. A *national land tax* might achieve the same goals, based on population, national income, and cultivatable land.

One further possibility would be *national indirect taxes* on the production of luxury goods or armaments, at least as they enter the international market. Many

present structures, including the U.N. and the World Bank, could serve here if the nations were willing.

FOREIGN INVESTMENTS

Also in need of development is the question of the property rights of former colonial rulers, or simply wealthy foreign powers, in poor countries. Many international problems arise from this issue, e.g., French holdings in Algeria, the Suez seizure, Cuba's nationalization of U.S. property. What, for example, are the rights of a colonizer to earn income from property often taken more or less by force? To what extent is nationalization of foreign property without compensation justifiable in cases where the country deems that the investor has already earned the original investment several times over? These questions are not easily resolved, yet they must be confronted by our moral theology if it is to be relevant and adequate to some of the central problems of our day. The theory of "macro-justice" needs further elaboration: at present, by omission, it seems to operate in favour of the possessors.

The second hypothesis, envisaging a redistribution of land and population, is strongly handicapped by race prejudice and deep cultural cleavages. Although I am aware of the complex and debatable aspects of these problems, I would like to touch on some points, particularly the demographic revolution occurring in Asia and the land-grab of uninhabited areas begun in the 16th century by the developed Western races and virtually completed today. At present non-whites are being systematically kept out of these regions. This brief space is no the place to examine the anti-Asian immigration laws of countries like Australia, Canada, the U.S. and Brazil, which, along with the eastern portions of the USSR, contain some of the great under-inhabited land masses of the world. But everybody is aware of the under-populated western parts of the U.S. and Canada; in a sense these are *underdeveloped lands*.

Comparisons of the average holding of a Canadian farmer and those of the Indian, Chinese or Japanese peasant are quite as stark as those commonly made between the rich and poor in underdeveloped countries. China today increases yearly at a rate roughly equivalent to Canada's entire population. Yet Canada consistently excludes non-whites, as does Australia, placed at the tip of Asia. Indeed, Australia pays whites to emigrate to her sparsely populated shores. If I were born of white parents, almost the entire under-inhabited world would be open to me to settle down and reproduce my kind. Australia, Canada, South Africa, Southern Rhodesia, etc., would not speak of unemployment and other difficulties. Yet these same countries

generously give non-whites arms to fight the Communists to make the world safe for political democracy and "Christian civilization". And they blame us when we are not enthusiastic.

There is nothing sacrosanct about the present distribution of the earth's surface. The enormous problems redistribution would entail are no good reason for rejecting it out of hand. Each year 100 million cross frontiers as tourists; 50 million attended the World's Fair. People hold up their hands in holy horror at South African Apartheid and segregation in the U.S. yet conveniently seem to ignore the grosser aspects of a policy of *world apartheid*.

INTERNATIONAL AUTHORITY

We need a theory of international social justice that faces this problem squarely, and practical remedies that will have effects *at least over a few generations*. World peace depends on it. The present policy of "increase and multiply and stay where you are, for we have filled the earth", cannot, humanly speaking, last. The need for an international authority in this matter is crucial today, yet when one proposes this part of the question, all kinds of alibis are offered for not discussing it seriously. Catholic authors are no different in this respect from others. *Only Marxists seem to take it seriously*.

We must face the issue as one of macro-justice, that is, concerned with giving each one his due in the macro evolution of world society. Imaginative and bold thinking is essential for a peaceful solution. If, at the worst, it is true that the white race cannot really cohabit with others, then is it unfair to ask it not to appropriate so much of the earth's surface for itself? If Australians and New Zealanders desire to preserve their racial, cultural, religious and linguistic identities, why could not the New Zealanders migrate to Australia and leave the islands to the Japanese? Or the U.N. could transport over a period of 30 years the 12 million Australians to the U.S., leaving Australia to the Indians? Or, again, the three to four million Canadians could descend to the U.S., freeing the vast plains of the west for Chinese as they gradually come over from Mongolia and Siberia.

If this all sounds fantastic, the simple fact remains that in the next 35 years the world must make room for an *additional billion Chinese*. By the year 2000 the whole of Oceania will still contain less than 30 million, while India will have an additional .6 to .7 billion to feed. Every means, including migration and advice in responsible parenthood, should be attempted. But at present there is silence on the possibilities of migration as a partial solution.

The present policy of the Western nations is unfortu-

nately a witness to their sense of racial monopoly and indifference to the implications of world economic democracy, despite their democratic creed politically. It denotes a glaring blindness to the logic of historical development, and may, as well, offer a partial explanation of the lack of gratitude shown by poor countries for what aid is given them.

INADEQUACY OF SOCIAL TEACHING

It is showing no disrespect for the late Pope John XXIII to suggest that certain aspects of *Mater et Magistra* and *Pacem in Terris* require further development. For example, though a good deal is made of the need for greater powers for the U.N., there does not seem to be a clear recognition that solutions to the problems of poverty in the midst of plenty should be based on social justice, rather than a mere extension of charity or voluntary international co-operation.

On some matters, such as agriculture, *Mater et Magistra* describes rather detailed remedies. Nearly ten of the encyclical's 75 pages (NCWC edition) are devoted to recommendations regarding public policy, taxation, capital at suitable interest rates, social insurance, price protection and so forth. However, on the problems of international justice, nowhere does the encyclical develop principles in any applied manner. The reference to the population problem is very general, except for a four-page treatment of the errors of birth control. *Pacem in Terris* leaves the problem in much the same way. Nor does Catholic reaction to the documents give the impression that they have been understood as appeals on the basis of social justice rather than that of benevolent paternalism. Though wonderful in other respects, in this sense they fail to measure up to the extent and urgency of the problems of world social justice.

Though the papacy says little today about migration in connection with population problems, there was a period, roughly between 1939 and 1954, when it made repeated and pointed demands that nations become more open to immigrants. Migration was put forward as a natural right of man, subject to the world common good. Pius XII spoke of the cruelty of those who closed doors to migrants, adding that no reason of state or pretext of collective advantage could justify the denial of this fundamental right. He addressed appeals and quasi-reprimands to Canada, the U.S., Australia, Argentina and Brazil. Apostolic Delegates, as in Canada, were mobilized for the cause, and the Apostolic Constitution of 1952, *Exsul Familia*, summarized the teaching and made further appeals.

One can only speculate on the relative silence since

1955. Is it that the theory has changed?—other solutions found? Certainly the problems remain. But perhaps the success of the European Common Market has made them less acute for European countries. The central authority of the Church has hardly ever raised the problems of anti-Asian legislation. It has made occasional reference to the needs of emigration for Japan, but has said or done very little in connection with the over-all problem.

The underdeveloped lands do not want to have to choose between mere political freedom, upheld by the West, and the Marxist promise of world economic democracy. This is all the more reason why the Church's failure to develop sufficiently clearly the theory of world economic relations *in terms of justice* is so crucial. It is also the paradox Christians in the East must live with: regarded by Easterners as too Western because we value what they call "this sham of mere political democracy," and by Westerners as not understanding *them* because we see the case made by Asians for world economic democracy.

The Church cannot for much longer continue to overlook the problem. What, for example, would Catholic social thinkers say if a few million Chinese were to walk into some under-inhabited parts of "White Australia"? Would they regard it as an exercise of "the natural right of God's children to God's earth," or would they summon the "people of God" to a new nuclear crusade against the diabolical forces of atheistic Communism? These are not abstract questions when even now Australians are going forth to meet the Chinese in Vietnam "to make the world safe for political democracy." The Church's ability for dialogue with China may, in a sense, become more and more a touchstone of her sincerity and sense of justice. As things stand now, Marxists and many non-Christian Easterners do not distinguish the spiritual concerns of the Church and the interests of the Western powers.

THEOLOGY OF THE AFFLUENT SOCIETY?

Although very important developments in theology have occurred during the past two decades, it is worthwhile noting that almost all of them originated in countries that are part of the affluent society. This is, of course, to the credit of these countries, but it may be less than ideal for the rest of the world. As scholastics used to say, nothing is in the intellect that has not been first in the senses; one cannot love without knowing. Infallibility does not compensate for lack of contact or openness of spirit. Between the 17th and 19th centuries Catholicism lost the workers because of value-blindness to their yearnings for justice—yearnings which Marx

was the first to appreciate, however much we may disagree with his analysis and solutions.

If Christians fail to realize the utter frustration being generated in countries like China and non-Communist Asia, as well as, to some extent, Africa and Latin America, the outlook for humanity and the Church is very bleak. The Church's silence may even be suicidal. The world is harsh in its judgment on the silence of the "Deputy", and the world is not less Christ-like for it.

If Christians would at least dissociate themselves from this situation of glaring international injustice, the Church's credentials would be in better shape. But this does not solve the problems themselves. In any case—though I hope I am wrong—realistically I do not see any substantial signs of a change of heart deep and serious enough to have an impact. These are problems polite society does not talk about; they are better forgotten like a bad dream. ●

Freedom of Speech

We have now recognised the necessity to the mental well-being of mankind (on which all their other well-being depends) of freedom of opinion, and freedom of the expression of opinion, on four distinct grounds: which we now briefly recapitulate.

First, if any opinion is compelled to silence, that opinion may, for aught we can certain know, be true. To deny this is to assume our own infallibility.

Secondly, though the silenced opinion be an error, it may, and very commonly does, contain a portion of truth and since the general or prevailing opinion on any subject is rarely or never the whole truth, it is only by the collision of adverse opinions that the remainder of the truth has any chance of being supplied.

Thirdly, even if the received opinion be not only true, but the whole truth; unless it is suffered to be, and actually is, vigorously and earnestly contested, it will, by most of those who receive it, be held in the manner of a prejudice with little comprehension or feeling of its rational grounds. And not only this, but, fourthly, the meaning of the doctrine itself will be in danger of being lost, or enfeebled, and deprived of its vital effect on the character and conduct; the dogma becoming a mere formal profession, inefficacious for good, but cumbering the ground, and preventing the growth of any real and heartfelt conviction, from reason or personal experience.

JOHN STUART MILL, *On Liberty*.

Letters

LITURGY OF UNIFICATION

Sir,—Fr. O'Riordan is to be congratulated on a practical discussion of liturgical adaptation in Africa.

But a question arises. It seems that this country is inevitably and rapidly progressing towards unification. Sixty percent of the Republic's labour force is African. The question has ceased to be as to whether the reserves can hold their population, and become that, as to whether any country can 'send home' sixty percent of its labour force. We would think it very odd policy for France or England. Then the second question: can a country keep its labour force permanently as strangers in its midst? If we are inevitably progressing towards unification, should we not work towards a Liturgy in which everyone, with concession and acceptance of the feelings of others, could feel at home, and so begin unification around the centre of all unity, the Holy Eucharist.

Details of adaptation, such as Fr. O'Riordan mentions, might be thought of better under the heading of local modifications of one Liturgy, as provided for by the Council, rather than a separate Liturgy.

F. SYNNOTT, *Hammanskraal*.

CELIBATE CLERGY

Sir,—In the SOUTHERN CROSS issue of the 8th September, Fr. David de Burgh wrote an article on vocations.

No one denies there is a shortage of priests, but according to Fr. de Burgh it is, to some degree, due to the selfishness and opposition of parents who stand in the way of would-be vocations. Can parents honestly be blamed for not wanting to allow their sons to enter the priesthood at the end of schooling? Evidently it is not taken into account that this decision might be regretted later on in life, when it may be too late to back out.

Owing to the fact that the vow of celibacy is compulsory, it is criminal to take in young people who will not be mature enough to meet these obligations. Having taken some major step—that of entering the seminary for instance—it is quite possible that a clear-sighted but weak young man is not able to turn back, though he feels more or less clearly that he ought to, for fear of the displeasure of his family or his social group. And then he has to think of the world of the seminary itself. What would his masters and his companions think of him if he left? The atmosphere of the semin-

aries has no doubt improved a great deal, but not to the stage where the fears that have been expressed would be baseless and ridiculous. Perfect obedience to the rules, great apostolic zeal, an ardent devotional life, absence of sexual difficulties—all these things can be ambiguous. Has a young boy, straight from school, the capacity to assume the burdens of the priesthood? When the candidate to the priesthood commits himself definitely, he should have attained emotional and sexual maturity, otherwise when he is thrown upon the world, he risks appearing as a non-existent, insignificant being, incapable of helping men to solve their problems according to the gospel. There can be many repressed anxieties that only come to the surface much later, and there are many priests to whom feminine sexuality means nothing, until it is no longer the right moment to recognise its existence.

The lack of vocations is not due to the opposition of parents alone, but also to the stringent rules which apply to the priesthood, namely celibacy. If we look around, we will see that there is not this same critical shortage of clergy in other denominations as in the Catholic Church, for they are able to live a normal balanced life, but nevertheless still a righteous one. A surcease from celibacy could not only encourage vocations to the priesthood, it might even generate them. What layman, or what priest if he tries to be honest, will admit that celibacy is the 'bright pearl', 'the finest ornament', 'the purest glory' of the Catholic priesthood? Celibacy forces the priest to be detached from human love, a love which is valid and sanctified, since Christ made it a Sacrament. Christ did not link the priesthood to consecrated celibacy.

There are priests in Holland, Germany, Denmark and America, who were originally protestant ministers with wives and families, but the Vatican has allowed them to be ordained priests, and they need not observe the vow of celibacy. Yet there are priests, according to the newspapers, who have been expelled from the priesthood through wanting to marry. It is not easy to live alone, even in sanctity. Are men more inclined to confide in celibate priests? On the contrary. In these countries where there are married priests, penitents seem to favour the priest with a wife. They feel themselves closer to the priest who has lived an existence like that of all men, sharing the same sufferings, joys and even weaknesses, and open their hearts to him more willingly.

The priest is living in the world, inside it, not beside it. It is necessary for him to have actual experience if he is to understand and redeem. If it is lawful to marry first then be ordained, why is it not lawful to be

first ordained then married? Women are capable of raising themselves to the level of the priest's mission. She can grasp its grandeur, make it her own, recognise its demands on him and on her, adapt her thoughts, feelings and conduct to it.

Although the Council of Trent in 1563 declared, 'It is more blessed to remain in virginity or in celibacy than to be joined in marriage' the 20th century Catholic is more touched by the council of St. Paul who said, 'It is better to marry than to burn'. In view of one eminent French theologian, it is far more important to have enough priests than to have celibacy.

To some thoughtful Catholics, the case for dispensing with celibacy altogether, or at least making its observance voluntary, is well worth considering with great care. Over the past three centuries Protestant ministers have shown a remarkable knack for siring sons who grow up to become Protestant ministers. At least as many sons of priests might be expected to follow in the footsteps of their fathers.

If priests were allowed to marry, there would be far more vocations than there are today, and such a priesthood would not entail the ambiguities, strains, falls and scandals which have been linked in fact, and always, with celibacy. If liberty of choice were left to the priests, those who chose celibacy would do so freely, and therefore it would be a free choice made under far better circumstances. Many people would gladly consecrate their lives to the service of God and men, and would be quite fit to do so, but they do not dare, because they feel themselves unequal to facing loyally the demands of celibacy.

It is believed that this type of existence is better adapted to the demands of the priest's mission, therefore we cannot agree with Fr. de Burgh's views that the lack of vocations are due to parental influence only, but is in the main, due to antiquated rules that are made compulsory, which is causing the famine in this direction, and unless some serious consideration is given to this problem, the lack of priestly vocations will not improve.

MRS. J. STEWART, *Durban.*

FR. FINBARR SYNNOTT is on the staff of St. Peter's Seminary at Hammanskraal in the Transvaal.

FR. COLIN COLLINS continues his series on aspects of Christianity.

FR. R. W. THYS, O.P., a professor of Philosophy in Holland visited South Africa recently.

ROSE MOSS is a South African now living in the United States.

FR. TISSA BALASURIYA, O.M.I., is a lecturer in Economics and Applied Theology at Aquinas College, Ceylon.

(Political comment and sub-editing in this issue by A. P. Goller.)

PUBLISHED BY THE EDITOR, A. P. GOLLER, 703 CAROLDENE, SOPER ROAD, BEREA, JOHANNESBURG AND PRINTED BY SHERRY & SHERRY (PTY) LTD., 52 MARLBOROUGH ROAD, SPRINGFIELD, JOHANNESBURG -73966



challenge

SLOWLY BUT SURELY the Liberal Party is being strangled. One by one its leaders are being picked off, its members subjected to intimidatory measures, its organisation disrupted, its ideals smeared by the propaganda organs of the Government and its lackeys. Of its national leaders, it would seem that only those who have international reputations have so far escaped the full rigour of the Nationalist regime's determination to crush all constitutional opposition to its policies. We are fast approaching the point where it will have become impossible to oppose in any significant political manner the measures of a tyrannical regime.

The Liberal Party does not exist by virtue of a privilege granted by benevolent rulers nor does it exist by permission of tolerant citizens. It exists by virtue of a fundamental human right, the right of individuals to associate with others to further common aims, to express their vision of the common good of all. The right to associate freely, to propose radical social, political, economic and cultural reforms cannot be denied to a group of citizens without due process of law; but even prior to this, very serious weight would have to be given to the paramountcy of the common good of which it has been said that 'in our time the common good is chiefly guaranteed when personal rights and duties are maintained. 'So far is it from being evident that the existence of the Liberal Party threatens the common good that this charge may be more properly laid against its chief accusers, the Government. The onus lies with the Government to prove that the Liberal Party has forfeited its right to exist: it has produced no such evidence, nor do we believe that such evidence could be produced in a court of law. Therefore, the Liberal Party has the right to continue to exist, to develop and to propagate its policies, to canvass openly for support: in short to function without hindrance and with the full protection of police and courts.

We could suggest many reasons why the white electorate will not protest against the mounting pressure on the Liberal Party and none of these reasons redound to the credit of those who will remain silent. Perhaps the most insidious of these is the belief that political polemic

An Independent Review

EDITED BY CATHOLIC LAYMEN

Volume Three

APRIL 1966

Number Two

COLIN COLLINS

The Church in the Modern World

A 'COMMONWEAL' EDITORIAL

On Debating Celibacy

INSTITUTE OF RACE RELATIONS

A Public Protest

GEORGE TAVARD

Vatican II and Race

G.M.A. JANSEN

Modern Theology for the Layman

ANON.

Illustration

LETTERS

CHALLENGE

P.O. BOX 5015, JOHANNESBURG

SUBSCRIPTION: R1 p.a. (post free)

15 cents

Ut omnes unum sint

or protest somehow destroys the possibility of 'fresh, unprejudiced examinations' of the root causes of social injustices in South Africa. Our primary answer to this is that those who acquiesce in the destruction of constitutional opposition are ensuring a bitter harvest of extra-constitutional (and not necessarily immoral) opposition. Our second answer to this argument is that its proponents must recognise that many individuals and organisations are systematically being denied the right to participate in such discussions. Thirdly, those who complain that polemic and protest against specific and general injustices merely distract attention from the real issues, must give proof that they recognise the real issues and, further, that they have a genuine compassion for the suffering of the many who are oppressed; a compassion that far transcends the irrelevant, pious statement that one treats those with whom one comes into close contact with justice and charity.

Because we know that the Liberal Party recognises and affirms the values of western civilization, more than most Christians in South Africa, we defend its right to exist. Although we may part company with it in the timing of one man, one vote, we do not believe that the suppression of the Liberal Party can be justified by reference to the supposed dangers of universal franchise or by fraudulent equation of Liberalism and Communism.

SOCIAL WELFARE AND THE WELFARE OF SOCIETY

NOT SO SUBTLE PRESSURE is being brought to bear on welfare organisations to recognise the arbitrary distinctions of the racialists. A near-blasphemous interpretation of the parable of the good Samaritan would have us believe that the racial categories of the pseudo-scientists are more binding than the Christian vocation to love one's neighbour.

To their credit, there are welfare organisations which do not recognise race as a criterion in their works of charity, and which see no validity in the veiled threat that white must minister to white and black to black. We are all in need of constant witnessing to the poverty and misery of our fellow men: it is already almost impossible to live with one's conscience amid the appalling miseries and glaring inequalities which we inflict upon our brothers. To distort the workings of charity, in its narrow sense, as much as we distort it in its full sense will have disastrous effects upon the integrity of Christians and gravely imperil the life of the Church in South Africa.

There are some who believe that only on the principle of unsegregated public worship will the Christian Churches stand firm, with whatever consequences this

may have for those who attempt to follow Christ. If, however, racialism has been allowed to poison all other springs of Christian life, and worship become confined to Church buildings, then even this is uncertain. If life in the world is in no sense worship of God, and therefore not subject to Christ's law, formal worship is equally valueless and requires no heroic defence from the Churches.

Catholics await the firm leadership of their bishops. Let them speak with the wisdom and courage which will be necessary to crush this evil distortion of the Gospel.

DEFENCE AND AID

LET US PARTICULARISE still more our comment above. The defence of those accused of political crimes and the support of their families and dependants is not a popular cause. Yet it is an essential service of justice and mercy. The recent banning of the Defence and Aid organisation and bannings of lawyers like Miss Ruth Hayman who undertake the defence of those accused of political crimes are proof, for those who still need proof, that the Government will not lightly tolerate those who defend the rights of others. Yet we cannot believe that Christians, who are enjoined to visit the imprisoned, are not to concern themselves either with the justice of their imprisonment or with the succour of their families. Indeed it may well be that now only the Churches can undertake to continue this work.

Has the time come for our Archbishop and Bishops to give effective, militant leadership which could involve them in personal suffering? If the moment has not come, the time has certainly come for them to preach Christian responsibility in such concrete fashion that each one of us can see his own responsibility and find the strength to accept it. The following are some not so tentative suggestions as to what this might mean.

One of the arguments for celibacy is that it enables those who espouse it to work more effectively for God. Surely it is not improper to suggest that this freedom from close family responsibility brings its own obligations and opportunities for service? Our clergy, brothers and sisters could benefit tremendously from a direct involvement in the work of mercy which support of the families and dependants of those accused of political crimes undoubtedly is. The hazards of such work are obvious, but how are our priests, brothers and sisters to achieve a starkly realistic understanding of the implications of Catholic social teaching, if not by direct involvement?

There are also laypeople with limited family responsibilities who could be inspired to serve their fellowmen

in the sphere under discussion. Is it unfair to suggest that they should be challenged to devote their time, money and energy to ensure that no man is denied adequate defence and that children do not suffer for the alleged sins of their fathers?

Then there are Catholics in the legal profession. If they were faced with a confrontation of all their responsibilities and duties would there still be so few Catholics among those who undertake the defence of those most in need of defence?

Colin Collins

The Church in the Modern World

THE CHURCH IN SOUTH AFRICA has been aware only intermittently of the Second Vatican Council which concluded at the end of last year. The South African bishops came and went to the Council over a period of years: occasional reports appeared in the Catholic and in the secular press: mainly in liturgical matters, has South Africa felt the effects of the Council in different ways.

The 16 documents issued by the Council are of tremendous significance. They manifest a change in the atmosphere of thinking within Christianity that will have repercussions for centuries. Centred in the key-thought of renewal within the Church these documents show that the Church has, at least in embryo, faced up to its challenges in the modern world.

In the first place a major change in direction is indicated in the central document of the Council which is on the Church itself. This Constitution on the Church is the foundation stone of all the others. New vistas of thinking and an openness in approach are also shown particularly in the documents on Ecumenism, Religious Liberty and in the shortest document of all—*The Church and non-Christian Religions*. These three schemas with their admonition for the Church, and Catholics, to engage in dialogue and to admit the good in all other religions and facets of life are of enormous significance for the future.

These and the other documents are not only important in themselves but are also important in their application to this country. It is hoped that in the pages of CHALLENGE such relevancy will be outlined in the next two to three years. The particular document,

The Church has resources of manpower and the skeleton of an organisation to offer to the other Churches and to those already involved in both defence and aid. Which came first in America: day-to-day involvement in the civil rights movement or a complete re-orientation of the life of the Church as a whole. More involvement would do more for the reform and renewal of the Church than any number of lectures and seminars.

however, that is most practically relevant and immediately applicable to the South African scene is the Constitution on the Church in the Modern World. This document incorporates virtually all of the more practical aspects of the Vatican Council's publications. Its relevancy to the South African scene rings out from almost every page. For this reason a straight-forward description of the various parts of the Constitution is given below. These thoughts are from one who confesses to being neither a theologian nor to having a knowledge of the background to this document. The next four issues of CHALLENGE will be devoted to the second part of the Constitution on the Church in the Modern World which deals with four major questions, viz. Marriage, Culture, Economic and Social Life and Politics.

The Constitution on the Church in the Modern World may be described as a World Vision for Modern Man.

A description of each word in this sentence is relevant. The vision is a world one: 'World' excludes anything that is hyper-national, partial or prejudiced. The next word is 'Vision': having a vision implies being objective participating in something that is more universal than particular, being above partisan policy. The vision is for 'Modern Man': 'modern' means the here and the now, and the future; 'modern' does not mean putting the clock back as sometimes happens in the policies of this country. The vision is for modern man: it is for all men. This is a Council document that has been addressed to all men—a factor perhaps unique within the Catholic Church:

'Therefore, the Council focuses its attention on the

world of men, the whole human family along with the sum of those realities in the midst of which it lives; that world which is the theatre of man's history, and the heir of his energies, his tragedies and his triumphs; that world which the Christian sees as created and sustained by its Maker's love, fallen indeed into the bondage of sin, yet emancipated now by Christ, Who was crucified and rose again to break the stranglehold of personified evil, so that the world might be fashioned anew according to God's design and reach its fulfillment.¹¹

Secondly, the Constitution might be described as a Christian view of a world-community of men living according to truth, justice and love. The view propounded in the Constitution is naturally enough a Christian one. Being Christian it is in and from Christ. This does not in any way detract from its reality but rather purports to enhance it. In this connection there is a nicety of balance between being too optimistic and too pessimistic. The following statement can only be described as healthy:

'Never has the human race enjoyed such an abundance of wealth, resources and economic power, and yet a huge proportion of the world's citizens are still tormented by hunger and poverty, while countless numbers suffer from total illiteracy. Never before has man had so keen an understanding of freedom, yet at the same time, new forms of social and psychological slavery make their appearance. Although the world of today has a very vivid awareness of its unity and of how one man depends on another in needful solidarity, it is most grievously torn into opposing camps by conflicting forces. For political, social, economic, racial and ideological disputes still continue bitterly, and with them the peril of a war which would reduce everything to ashes. True, there is a growing exchange of ideas, but the very words by which key concepts are expressed to take on quite different meanings in diverse ideological systems. Finally, man painstakingly searches for a better world, without a corresponding spiritual advancement.'¹²

SCIENCE AND UNITY

This Christian view is of a world community of men. Perhaps the two most dominant notes of the Constitution's description of such a community are the fact that the world is rapidly becoming a science-dominated one on the one hand and at the same time is rapidly becoming more one, more united. These two dominant themes run throughout the Constitution. A single quotation will suffice:

'This scientific spirit has a new kind of impact on the cultural sphere and on modes of thought. Technology is now transforming the face of the earth, and is already trying to master outer space. To a certain extent, the human intellect is also broadening its dominion over time; over the past by means of historical knowledge; over the future by the art of projecting and by planning.

Advances in biology, psychology and the social sciences not only bring men hope of improved self-knowledge; in conjunction with technical methods, they are helping men exert direct influence on the life of social groups.

At the same time, the human race is giving steadily increasing thought to forecasting and regulating its own population growth. History itself speeds along on so rapid a course that an individual person can scarcely keep abreast of it. The destiny of the human community has become all of a piece, where once the various groups of men had a kind of private history of their own.

Thus, the human race has passed from a rather static concept of reality to a more dynamic, evolutionary one. In consequence there has arisen a new series of problems, a series as numerous as can be, calling for new efforts of analysis and synthesis.¹³

This world community of men should live according to truth, justice and love. This aspect is also a thread that runs through the Church in the Modern World. 'Truth, justice and love' signify right attitudes and emotions between men within the Church and in the State. Even here, however, there is no over-rated optimism. The Constitution faces squarely up to the problems:

'Nevertheless, in the face of the modern development of the world, the number constantly swells of the people who raise the most basic questions or recognize them with a new sharpness: what is man? What is this sense of sorrow, of evil, of death, which continues to exist despite so much progress? What purpose have these victories secured at so high a cost? What can man offer to society, what can he expect from it? What follows this earthly life?

The Church firmly believes that Christ, who died and was raised up for all, can through his Spirit offer man the light and the strength to measure up to his supreme destiny. Nor has any other name under heaven been given to man by which it is fitting for him to be saved. She likewise holds that in her most benign Lord and Master can be found the key, the focal point and the goal of man, as well as of all human history. The Church also maintains that

beneath all changes there are many realities which do not change and which have their ultimate foundation in Christ, Who is the same yesterday and today, yes and forever. Hence under the light of Christ, the image of the unseen God, the firstborn of every creature, the Council wishes to speak to all men in order to shed light on the mystery of man and to co-operate in finding the solution to the outstanding problems of our time.⁴

The Constitution is divided into two major parts. The first part is entitled 'The Church and Man's Calling'. This section deals more generally with Man, the Church and Man in the Modern World. The second part of the Constitution deals with some particular problems of special urgency.

In the first part of the Constitution on Man's Calling there are four separate chapters. They deal with the Dignity of the Human Person, the Community of Mankind, Man's Activity throughout the World and the Role of the Church in the Modern World. Because of their connection the first two chapters can be treated of together and the second two likewise.

COMMUNITY OF HUMAN PERSONS

It is difficult to describe in summary form these two central ideas. The emphasis on the dignity of the human person is perhaps the greatest contribution that Christianity has made to our times. The correlative idea of a community of human persons has not merely been forced on Christianity by the modern world, but rather Christianity has matured in its idea of community through and in modern society. These two ideas are so important that a full reading of the text of the Constitution on the Church in the Modern World, which is in itself a summary of the Church's teaching on the question, is called for. All that can be done here is to point out some of the significant points concerning these two ideas and to consider them particularly in a South African context.

A starkly realistic Man is presented in the Constitution:

'Therefore man is split within himself. As a result, all of human life, whether individual or collective, shows itself to be a dramatic struggle between good and evil, between light and darkness. Indeed, man finds that by himself he is incapable of battling the assaults of evil successfully, so that everyone feels as though he is bound by chains. But the Lord Himself came to free and strengthen man, renewing him inwardly and casting out that 'prince of this world' (John 12:31) who held him in the bondage of sin. For sin has diminished man, blocking his path to ful-

filment.

The call to grandeur and the depths of misery, both of which are a part of human experience, find their ultimate and simultaneous explanation in the light of this revelation.⁵

While man is split because of the forces within himself, at the same time he possesses a certain oneness. Such unity within the human person pushes into the background that dichotomy that has sometimes been manifest in the Church's teaching concerning man's body and soul and lays the foundation for a new approach regarding many problems:

'Though made of body and soul, man is one. Through his bodily composition he gathers to himself the elements of the material world; thus they reach their crown through him, and through him raise their voice in free praise for the Creator. For this reason man is not allowed to despise his bodily life; rather he is obliged to regard his body as good and honourable since God has created it and will raise it up on the last day. Nevertheless wounded by sin, man experiences rebellious stirrings in his body. But the very dignity of man postulates that man glorify God in his body and forbids it to serve the evil inclinations of his heart.

Now, man is not wrong when he regards himself as superior to bodily concerns, and as more than a speck of nature or a nameless constituent of the city of man. For by his interior qualities he outstrips the whole sum of mere things. He plunges into the depths of reality whenever he enters into his own heart; God, Who probes the heart, awaits him there: there he discerns his proper destiny beneath the eyes of God. Thus, when he recognizes in himself a spiritual and immortal soul, he is not being mocked by a fantasy born only of physical or social influences, but is rather laying hold of the proper truth of the matter.'⁶

HUMAN FREEDOM

The acme of the human person is freedom:

'For God has willed that man remain 'under the control of his own decisions', so that he can seek his Creator spontaneously, and come freely to utter and blissful perfection through loyalty to Him. Hence man's dignity demands that he act according to a knowing and free choice that is personally motivated and prompted from within not under blind internal impulse nor by mere external pressure.'⁷

In the midst of these notes on the human person, it is interesting to see a little jewel that would seem to be far more at home in the work of a French existentialist

philosopher than in a Vatican Council document:

'It is in the face of death that the riddle of human existence grows most acute. Not only is man tormented by pain and by the advancing deterioration of his body, but even more so by a dread of perpetual extinction. He rightly follows the intuition of his heart when he abhors and repudiates the utter ruin and total disappearance of his own person.'⁸

Man's dignity is above all seen again and again in his oneness with others:

'What does the most reveal God's presence, however, is the brotherly charity of the faithful who are united in spirit as they work together for the faith of the Gospel and who prove themselves a sign of unity.'⁹

In the section on the Community of Man many important points relevant to the South African scene are brought out. Connecting this section with the previous one on the Dignity of the Human Person is the fact that human institutions are for men and not men for institutions:

'Man's social nature makes it evident that the progress of the human person and the advance of society itself hinge on one another. For the beginning, the subject and the goal of all social institutions is and must be the human person, which for its part and by its very nature stands completely in need of social life. Since this social life is not something added on to man, through his dealings with others, through reciprocal duties, and through fraternal dialogue he develops all his gifts and is able to rise to his destiny.'¹⁰

Men, too, are ever-growing in interdependence:

'Every day human interdependence tightens and spreads by degrees over the whole world. As a result the common good, that is, the sum of those conditions of social life which allow social groups and their individual members relatively thorough and ready access to their own fulfilment, today takes on an increasingly universal complexion and consequently involves rights and duties with respect to the whole human race. Every social group must take account of the needs and legitimate aspirations of other groups and even of the general welfare of the entire human family.'¹¹

INTERDEPENDENCE

Such interdependence, which is casually dismissed as an economic one, is part and parcel of the racial situation in South Africa. Despite policies to the contrary, every thinking person in this country knows that South Africa is a country ever growing into greater unity. The

laws that are made to break that unity are very often a façade to obscure discrimination.

In this section too human rights so frequently described in previous encyclicals are once more outlined:

'At the same time, however, there is a growing awareness of the exalted dignity proper to the human person, since he stands above all things, and his rights and duties are universal and inviolable. Therefore, there must be made available to all men everything necessary for leading a life truly human, such as food, clothing, and shelter; the right to choose a state of life freely and to found a family, the right to education, to employment, to a good reputation, to respect, to appropriate information, to activity in accord with the upright norm of one's own conscience, to protection of privacy and to rightful freedom, even in matters religious.'¹²

All that one can say is what these rights are concerning the non-Whites in South Africa. For Catholics and other Christians to ignore them is sinful.

The Constitution goes on to condemn discrimination in an outright fashion:

'True, all men are not alike from the point of view of varying physical power and the diversity of intellectual and moral resources. Nevertheless, with respect to the fundamental rights of the person, every type of discrimination, whether social or cultural, whether based on sex, race, colour, social condition, language or religion, is to be overcome and eradicated as contrary to God's intent. For in truth it must be regretted still that fundamental personal rights are not yet being universally honoured.'¹³

Yet in South Africa rights are often accorded to the non-White peoples only in the measure that the White man desires to do so. And this happens in a country that is professedly Christian!

POVERTY

Amongst the problems of the human community mentioned is particularly the one of poverty:

'Now a man can scarcely arrive at the needed sense of responsibility, unless his living conditions allow him to become conscious of his dignity, and to rise to his destiny by spending himself for God and for others. But human freedom is often crippled when a man encounters extreme poverty, just as it withers when he indulges in too many of life's comforts and imprisons himself in a kind of splendid isolation. Freedom acquires new strength, by contrast, when a man consents to the unavoidable requirements of social life, takes on the manifold demands of human partnership and commits himself to the service of

the human community.¹⁴

Although occasionally the problems of malnutrition, e.g. among the Africans in the reserves, are mentioned, yet it is a strange phenomenon of South Africa that organizations that try to do something about it are considered to be interfering in politics. In a wealthy country such as South Africa, the problem of malnutrition should be considered realistically and attention drawn to it should not be taken as an insult to a hyper-sensitive Government.

The subject of Man and the Church in the Modern World is handled in Chapters 3 and 4 of Part I of the Constitution. These chapters are called: Man's Activity throughout the World and the Role of the Church in the Modern World. The two main ideas in these two chapters are man's domination over nature and the complementary idea of the Christian involvement in the reality surrounding him.

In the modern world man's domination over nature comes particularly through the achievements of science and technology:

'Through his labours and his native endowments man has ceaselessly striven to better his life. Today, however, especially with the help of science and technology, he has extended his mastery over nearly the whole of nature and continues to do so. Thanks to increased opportunities for many kinds of social contact among nations, the human family is gradually recognizing that it comprises a single world community and is making itself so. Hence many benefits once looked for, especially from heavenly powers, man has now enterprisingly procured for himself.'¹⁵

'Throughout the course of the centuries, men have laboured to better the circumstances of their lives through a monumental amount of individual and collective effort. To believers, this point is settled: considered in itself, this human activity accords with God's will. For man, created to God's image, received a mandate to subject to himself the earth and all it contains, and to govern the world with justice and holiness; a mandate to relate himself and the totality of things to Him Who was to be acknowledged as the Lord and Creator of all. Thus, by the subjection of all things to man, the name of God would be wonderful in all the earth.'¹⁶

Once more in this part the unity of mankind is stressed:

'To those, therefore, who believe in divine love, He gives assurance that the way of love lies open to men and that the effort to establish a universal brotherhood is not a hopeless one. He cautions them at the

same time that this love is not something to be reserved for important matters, but must be pursued chiefly in the ordinary circumstances of life.'¹⁷

HISTORY MORE HUMAN

In some very interesting passages the relationship between the Church and the World and the Church and the State are described. These passages are particularly relevant to our country:

'Pursuing the saving purpose which is proper to her, the Church does not only communicate divine life to men, but in some way casts the reflected light of that life over the entire earth, most of all by its healing and elevating impact on the dignity of the person, by the way in which it strengthens the seams of human society and imbues the everyday activity of men with a deeper meaning and importance. Thus through her individual members and her whole community, the Church believes she can contribute greatly toward making the family of man and its history more human.

The Church recognizes that worthy elements are found in to-day's social movements, especially an evolution toward unity, a process of wholesome socialization and of association in civic and economic realms.'¹⁸

These paragraphs stand as glaring accusations of South Africa's emphasis on cultural differences between the various races. They certainly sound the death-knell of the social-racialistic tendencies that received their initial impulse in de Gobineau's works, were re-iterated in fascism and nazism, and are found in this country even among Catholic writers.

WORK OF THE LAITY

The role of the laity in the modern world is also described particularly in paragraph 43. This role which has been described in the Constitution on the Church and the documents on Laity is brought out clearly in The Church in the Modern World:

'Since they have an active role to play in the whole life of the Church, laymen are not only bound to penetrate the world with a Christian spirit, but are also called to be witnesses to Christ in all things in the midst of human society.'¹⁹

The laity are urged to bring about a change in the society in which they live. The question may well be asked whether the laity has done anything about the socio-political structure of South Africa. This is particularly applicable to the problems suggested in Part II of the Constitution.

Part II of the Constitution on the Modern World is

headed: Some Problems of Special Urgency. The five chapter headings are:—

- Fostering the Nobility of Marriage and the Family.
- The Proper Development of Culture.
- Economic and Social Life.
- The Life of the Political Community.
- The Fostering of Peace and the Promotion of a Community of Nations.

As subsequent issues of CHALLENGE will be devoted to these individual problems it is not necessary at this stage to go into details concerning them.

In the chapter on Marriage some new developments are indicated in Catholic think ing:

‘Marriage to be sure is not instituted solely for procreation; rather, its very nature as an unbreakable compact between persons, and the welfare of the children, both demand that the mutual love of the spouses be embodied in a rightly ordered manner, that it grow and ripen. Therefore, marriage persists as a whole manner and communion of life, and maintains its value and indissolubility, even when, despite the often intense desire of the couple, offspring are lacking.’²⁰

The chapter on Culture is one that is really significant for South Africa particularly as so much nonsense is spoken about culture in this country. In this chapter the universality of culture is discussed, the function of authority and the need for freedom. Perhaps the most relevant paragraph for South African conditions is par. 54 which reads:

‘. . . The increase of commerce between the various nations and groups of men opens more widely to all the treasures of different civilizations and thus, little by little, there develops a more universal form of human culture, which better promotes and expresses the unity of the human race to the degree that it preserves the particular aspects of the different civilizations. . . . This becomes more clear if we consider the unification of the world and the duty which is imposed upon us, that we build a better world based upon truth and justice. Thus we are witnesses of the birth of a new humanism, one in which man is defined first of all by this responsibility to his brothers and to history.’²¹

It is curious that here in South Africa everyone who promotes inter-cultural contacts is placed under a dark cloud (whether that be of banning or not).

The Chapter on Economic and Social Life is also particularly relevant. In summary form the whole question of human rights, trade unions and private property are handled. In one particular paragraph the whole question of migratory labour and its evils are

out-rightly condemned by the Constitution:

‘When workers come from another country or district and contribute to the economic advancement of a nation or region by their labour, all discrimination as regards wages and working conditions must be carefully avoided. All the people, moreover, above all the public authorities, must treat them not as mere tools of production but as persons, and must help them to bring their families to live with them and to provide themselves with a decent dwelling; they must also see to it that these workers are incorporated into the social life of the country or region that receives them. Employment opportunities, however, should be created in their own areas as far as possible.’²²

The chapter on Political Life has many paragraphs relevant to South Africa and a full reading is necessary. One section is glaringly obvious:

‘It is in full conformity with human nature that there should be juridico-political structures providing all citizens in an ever better fashion and without any discrimination the practical possibility of freely and actively taking part in the establishment of the juridical foundations of the political community and in the direction of public affairs, in fixing the terms of reference of the various public bodies and in the election of political leaders.’²³

The Constitution on the Church in the Modern World is a genuinely great document. If examined in detail it could form a pattern for Christian attitudes in the world. It should be studied and re-studied by every Christian who takes his religion and his life seriously. No one can afford to ignore this Constitution. One of its final admonitions is as follows:

‘Drawn from the treasures of Church teaching, the proposals of this Sacred Synod look to the assistance of every man of our time, whether he believes in God, or does not explicitly recognize Him. If adopted, they will promote among men a sharper insight into their full destiny, and thereby lead them to fashion the world more to man’s surpassing dignity, to search for a brotherhood which is universal and more deeply rooted, and to meet the urgencies of our age with a gallant and unified effort born of love.’²⁴

1. Constitution on the Church in the Modern World, par. 2.
2. Ibid. par. 2.
3. Ibid. par. 5.
4. Ibid. par. 10.
5. Ibid. par. 13.
6. Ibid. par. 14.
7. Ibid. par. 17.
8. Ibid. par. 18.
9. Ibid. par. 21.
10. Ibid. par. 25.
11. Ibid. par. 26.
12. Ibid. par. 26.

13. Ibid. par. 29.
14. Ibid. par. 31.
15. Ibid. par. 33.
16. Ibid. par. 34.
17. Ibid. par. 38.
18. Ibid. pars. 40 and 42.
19. Ibid. par. 43.
20. Ibid. par. 50.
21. Ibid. par. 54.
22. Ibid. par. 66.
23. Ibid. par. 82.
24. Ibid. par. 91.

On Debating Celibacy

AMONG THE CHARACTERISTICS of the Church which the world for centuries simultaneously admired and distrusted was its internal harmony. The admirers marvelled at its ability to sail through history without sinking, weathering one storm after another. The detractors also marvelled, but saw mainly the power inherent in any totalitarian organization to survive if it effectively controlled the life of its members. Today the Church probably has more admirers than detractors, but for some very different reasons. Vatican II showed a Church willing to risk some of the pitfalls which confront free institutions. For once, it seemed, the Church was willing to relinquish some tested methods of internal control for the sake of truth and personal conscience. The results of this change, tentative and groping as it has been, could probably have been foreseen: progress mixed with confusion, enthusiasm with bewilderment, hope with dread.

The problem of celibacy is a good case in point. There have always been complaints in the Church about the wisdom of an inflexible law joining a vocation to the priesthood and celibacy. There have always been priests who left the priesthood because the law was too much for them to bear, or stayed at the price of personal immaturity. There have always been priests who engaged in casual affairs. There have always been those who believed that some married priests would prove advantageous to the Church. Nonetheless the Church persevered in upholding the law and managed, all the while, to keep the suggestions, complaints and the scandals away from the public eye. There is no reason to be cynical about this strategy. The Church has never claimed celibacy is easy, only that it is possible and valuable. With a certain psychological shrewdness, it recognized that nothing short of an unquestioning affirmation of a celibate clergy would suffice to keep the law intact. In itself, celibacy is difficult to bear; it may become insupportable if there is widespread doubt about its wisdom.

It seems reasonable to suppose that this latter consideration may have been paramount in Pope Paul's

mind when he requested the Council Fathers not to debate the subject publicly in St. Peter's. He did not say that the matter should be dropped altogether in the Church, or that others could not discuss it. But he clearly wanted it to be handled quietly and delicately. As it has turned out, his hopes have proved impossible of fulfilment. Once raised, the issue could not be buried in private episcopal memorandums or obscure theological journals. More than that, the mounting intensity of the debate proves the instinctive wisdom of the old *de facto* rule that nothing at all should be said against the law. The more it is talked about and argued about, the more likely it is that the present generation of celibate priests will find their vow harder to bear.

We think this point worth stressing. For every priest who welcomes an article against universal and inflexible celibacy, there is probably another who feels his commitment is being attacked and undermined. Tension alleviated for one priest may be tension created for another. Something very similar has happened among the laity in the birth control debate: countless parents are relieved that the issue is finally out in the open; but many others are deeply disheartened to discover that their painful sacrifices may turn out to have been unnecessary. The human cost of open debate can be high.

Can anything be done about this cost? We doubt it. Celibacy should have been debated long ago. The practical wisdom of a monolithic affirmation of celibacy should have given way to an even higher wisdom, that of recognizing the human need to consciously admit to be paid for psychological repression and administrative suppression. That price is a violent, often irrational reaction. Once lost, balance is not easy to regain. The most the Church can hope for now is that the unreason of silence will not be replaced by the unreason of frantic bickering. This is not too much to hope for. But it will require a permissive magisterium, a sensitivity on the part of writers, and the courage of the Church to let everyone concerned present testimony. Nothing less will do. ●

Institute of Race Relations

A Public Protest

THE SOUTH AFRICAN Institute of Race Relations learnt with a deep sense of shock and incredulity of the banning of its Field Officer, Mr. J. C. M. Mbata. It immediately addressed itself to the Minister of Justice, requesting that he receive a deputation consisting of Dr. E. G. Malherbe (the President), Dr. B. Friedman, Mr. I. A. Maisels Q.C. and the Hon. O. D. Schreiner, to 'seek elucidation of the cause of the banning; and plead that the banning be so relaxed that Mr. Mbata be allowed to continue to work for the Institute or be enabled to find some work suitable to his qualifications'.

It has now received a reply from the Minister refusing this request:

'The Minister gave his careful consideration to the activities of Mbata before steps were taken and there does not appear to be any reason to justify a change in the restrictions imposed upon the abovementioned.'

The Executive Committee of the Institute itself has every confidence in Mr. Mbata's integrity and propriety and cannot conceive of any reason for the imposition of an order which deprives him of his livelihood, restricts his religious freedom to attendance at one parish church, prohibits normal social intercourse and prevents him from using the skills he has acquired over many years of study and work in the fields where these qualifications can most effectively be put to constructive use, namely those of education and race relations.

Mr. Mbata was in the service of the Institute for eight years, and carried out his duties with loyalty and devotion. Before this Mr. Mbata was for ten years headmaster of a secondary school in Vereeniging, and thereafter he was a supervisor of schools in the Department of Bantu Education, with about 40 schools under his care. He is a prominent member of the Church of the Province and has represented his parish at synods for some years. In 1960 when the existing African political organisations were declared unlawful and there was no central body for the expression of African views and aspirations, he was one of the prominent Africans who strove for a short time to bring into being a new body, the All-in African Conference. A number of

these (including Mr. Mbata) resigned from the organising committee but the whole original committee was arrested on 20 March, 1961, on a charge of furthering the aims and objects of a banned organisation. All were subsequently acquitted on appeal.

In his work for the Institute, Mr. Mbata acted as liaison with the African people, who held him in the highest regard. His duties were varied, including case work, advice to Africans in regard to educational and other matters, particularly in the development of their own voluntary organisations. He undertook investigations and surveys as directed by the Executive, the results of which, freely available to all, were of great importance and value. The restrictions on Mr. Mbata deprive the Institute of a vital link with the African people and deprive this country of one of the few remaining points of unofficial contact between racial groups increasingly divided from and unknowing of each other.

The Institute records, as so many others have done, its solemn protest against a system which strips a man of his life's purpose, and denies him the right to use the qualifications which has taken him a lifetime of application to acquire, without laying any charge against him, without informing him of the reasons for his restriction, and without giving him any opportunity to be heard. ●

Responsible partners who see themselves obliged to contraceptive marital intercourse, not lightly and habitually, but rather as a regrettable emergency solution, may take it that by doing so they do not exclude themselves from Communion at the Eucharistic table. They will realize, in all humility, that they are only on the way towards a mature marital love in full harmony with God's will, and that they must honestly strive to respond to God's loving invitation in the fullness of love.

—Cardinal Döpfner, Archbishop of Munich-Freising
(Quoted in the *London Tablet*, March 12, 1966.)

Vatican II and Race

THE POPULAR NOTION OF race has no theological content in Catholic thought, for which all men constitute only one race. Differences of features, skin pigmentation, height, hair can be no more than accidental modifications of one and the same type of man. Whatever their biological or historical origin, they do not introduce fundamental differences in the human race. Their occasional coincidence with cultural and sociological distinctions are historical contingencies which have relevance to explain the variety of the one human race, but can never be sharp enough to break the unity of mankind. This of course is a theological, not a scientific position. It has no relation to the debate about monogenism or polygenism, although monogenism would seem to be better in keeping with it. It does not arise from the common—though perhaps not necessary—belief that the human race derives from one original couple made of one man and one woman. It derives from the basic premise that when the Word was made flesh, he identified himself, not only with the semitic, near-eastern type of man then living in Galilee and Judea, but with all types of men, thus manifesting and achieving in himself the fundamental unity of all men.

This point is borne out specially by the Vatican Council's concept of man in *Constitution On the Church*. The People of God is one, since 'it was Christ who made this new compact, the new covenant in his own blood (1 Cor. 11:25), summoning from both Jew and Gentile a people that would be unified not through natural means but in the Spirit, and that would be the new People of God' (n.9). The only distinction among men known to the New Testament, that of Jew and Gentile, has been abolished in the Church. That the unity of the People of God is created by the Spirit rather than by natural means does not do away with the natural unity of the human race; it rather means that the unity of the People is destined to evidence and to strengthen the natural unity of man. 'Accordingly, this messianic people, though it does not actually include all men and at times appears to be a small flock, is nevertheless the indestructible source of unity,

hope and salvation for the entire human race' (n.9).

Legitimate differences and distinctions in the Church cannot therefore be grounded in the idea that different races exhibit distinctive human characteristics. On the contrary, 'in all the peoples of the world there is present the one People of God, which takes its citizens from all nations, making them citizens of a kingdom that is not earthly but heavenly in nature' (n.13). The Church unifies. Yet she respects the legitimate diversities, 'the abilities, resources and traditions of the various peoples insofar as they are good' (n.13). She admits of many varieties within herself:

'Among its members there is diversity either by reason of duties, as is true in the case of those who exercise the sacred ministry for the good of their brethren, or by reason of their condition and kind of life, as is true in the case of those many persons in the religious state who, striving for holiness by a narrower path, stimulate their brethren by their example. Furthermore, within the Church's communion there rightly exist particular churches which possess their own special traditions without prejudice to the primacy of the Chair of Peter, which presides over differences while assuring that these differences do not harm unity but rather aid it.' (n.13). Thus, legitimate diversities within the People of God are ascribed to differences in vocations, and therefore to the initiative of the Spirit, and never to differences in human origin, racial or otherwise.

With the Holy Scriptures, the Council must therefore affirm:

"The chosen People of God are one: 'one Lord, one faith, one baptism' (Eph., 4:5); the members have a common dignity by reason of their regeneration in Christ; there is the same grace of sonship and the same vocation to perfection: there is only one salvation, one hope and one undivided charity. In Christ and in the Church, therefore, there is no inequality based on race, nationality, social condition or sex, because 'there is no distinction between Jew and Greek, slave and freeman, male and female, for you are all one person in Christ' (Gal., 3.28) (n.32)."

However, when the Council uses the word *race* in this connection, it obviously understands it in its empirical, vernacular meaning, not in its theological sense. Theologically, the word *race* applies only to mankind as a whole. Its broader use by the Council does not mean approval of the popular idea behind it, which is contradicted by all principles of Christian anthropology. It should also be noted that the Latin word used is *stirps*, which does not really mean 'race' but 'origin'. This was the word used by Bishop Robert Tracy, of Baton Rouge (Louisiana) in his conciliar speech of October 24, 1963. The Latin language has no word for 'race' because the Latin people, although they were acquainted with black Africans, with North African Numids, with several kinds of semitic peoples, had no awareness of racial difference. For this reason, Bishop Tracy explained the meaning he gave to *stirps* by translating it in four languages (Italian, English, French, German).

THE CRUX OF THE CROSS

Since Bishop Tracy's address was the most forceful of the whole Council on this topic, the main passage should be quoted. The Bishop spoke to the original chapter 3 of the schema on the Church, in the name of 147 American bishops:

'The schema speaks of the equality of all men at the national and social level. One should also speak of racial equality in order to stress the ontological equality of all the members of the People of God. Racial discrimination is absolutely opposed to the truth that God is the Creator of all men, who have the same rights and the same dignity. This condemnation of racism corresponds to the passage of St. Paul where all distinctions between Jew and Greek are excluded. This text must be understood in the sense of a total rejection of discrimination in the religious, cultural and racial as well as national orders. The introduction of this in the schema would help the bishops to spread the teaching of the Church, which condemns all racial discrimination. This would have international relevance and would bring comfort to the victims of racism, who are deprived of the most elementary natural rights. . . . We therefore ask that a solemn doctrinal declaration in favour of the equality of all men, with reference to nation and to race, be included in the chapter on the People of God.'

In the event, the Constitution *De Ecclesia* solemnly taught the equality of all men in the Church, which implies their equality according to creation and to the natural order. It was, however, left to other documents to speak more specifically of the practical problems of

race relations among men of today.

Immediately following from the ecclesiological principles of the Council, the missionary nature and function of the Church throws light on her fundamental attitude to the concept of race. For the Church has the mission to preach the Gospel to all nations and to bring all peoples of the world, irrespective of their racial characteristics, their cultural level or their history, into the oneness of the People of God:

'Christ, and the Church which bears witness to Him through the preaching of the Gospel, transcends all particularism of race or nation, and therefore neither Christ nor the Church may ever be considered alien to any place or to any thing' (*Decree on the Church's Missionary Activity*, n.8).

This transcendence above superficial human distinctions entails the moral obligation of all the faithful to ignore differences of race in their social relations. This is true at the level of the virtue of love:

'Christian love truly extends to all men, without any distinction of race, of social condition or of religion; it expects no profit and no gratitude. God loved us with a gratuitous love; likewise, may the faithful be concerned, in their love, about man himself, loving him with the same movement through which God sought us' (n.12).

It is equally true at the level of patriotism, which is part of the virtue of justice:

'(Christians) must live for God and for Christ according to the customs and the behaviour of their country, in order to foster truly and efficaciously, as good citizens, love for their homeland, avoiding also absolutely contempt for foreign races, exaggerated nationalism, and promoting universal love among men' (n.15).

CONTRARY TO THE MIND OF CHRIST

The Council's *Declaration on the Church's Relations with Non-Christian Religions* contains an explicit reference to racial discrimination. The setting of this Declaration is not to be sought for in the inner-Church situation, as that of the Constitution *De Ecclesia* was, but in the world situation as shared by all believers in one God. In the context of fraternity among the main world religions, the Council affirms:

'We cannot invoke God, the Father of all men, if we refuse to behave fraternally toward some of the men created in God's image. The relation of man to God the Father and his relation to man his brother are so linked together that Scripture says: 'He who has no love does not know God' (1 John, 4:8). Thus the foundation of all theory or practice which introduces a distinction between man and man, between people

and people, relative to human dignity and the ensuing rights, is undermined. The Church therefore reproaches, as contrary to the mind of Christ, all discrimination or vexation exercised against men by reason of their race, their colour, their class or their religion.' (n.5).

This statement clearly is intended first of all for the Church's members. Yet it includes a condemnation of all racial discrimination by any men whatsoever. The mind of the Council was certainly to make a universally valid declaration, irrespective of local circumstances and historical antecedents, based on the nature of man's relationship to God the Creator, which is the same for all mankind. We should notice that the text uses the word *vexation* in its strong Latin sense rather than in the watered down meaning it has acquired in English: It is stronger than *discrimination*. Thus both the milder (*discriminatio*) and the harsher (*vexatio*) forms of persecution are condemned. The text also uses the two words *stirps* and *colour*, race and colour. In some countries, like the United States, race and colour have practically the same meaning, while in others, like the Latin countries, colour would not be commonly understood as qualifying a man. The Council takes the two words in both their identical and their distinctive meanings, in order to embrace as many situations as possible and to make a statement having universal relevance, regardless of the various sensibilities of men to race or to skin pigmentation.

ALIEN TO CHRISTIAN THEOLOGY

The Council's *Declaration on Religious Liberty* does not mention race and racial questions. Yet it throws some light on the problem, insofar as its description of the common good of society and the requirements of public order assumes the equality of all citizens within one nation. By citizens, the Council clearly means all men living within the defined borders of a country, except foreigners who are temporarily or permanently residing there: it never occurred to the drafters of the document on Religious Liberty that a state might define citizenship according to skin-colour tests or according to the racial origins of its various peoples, thus leaving large sections of the population outside of active citizenship. That this did not occur to them confirms the fact that it is entirely alien to Christian theology and to the humanistic tradition deriving from Christianity.

'The common good of society—sum total of the conditions of social life which allow man to achieve his perfection more fully and more easily—consists in the first place in the protection of the rights and duties of the human person.' (n.6) The case of religious liberty

is only one particular aspect of the wider problem of liberty. By defining the conditions and necessities of religious liberty, the Council therefore indirectly insists on all human liberties for all men without unjust discrimination founded on social or racial categories. 'All civil power has the essential duty to protect and promote the inviolable rights of man'. (n.6) Admittedly, the requirements of public order may permit the restriction of freedom in certain dangerous areas of national life, just as it may justify the occasional curbing of religious liberty in order to protect the rights of others. Restrictive measures, however,

'must not be taken arbitrarily, and must not favour unjustly one only of the parties concerned. They must follow the juridical norms in keeping with the objective moral order, as required—for the effective protection of the rights of all citizens—for the peaceful harmonisation of these rights—by an adequate care of genuine public peace, which consists in a life led in common on the basis of true justice—and for the safeguard of public morality' (n.7).

The combined consideration of all these points brings the following conclusion to light:

'One must preserve the general law of true freedom in society, that is, respect the maximum human freedom, and restrict it only when, and no more than, necessity requires.' (n.7).

There is no suggestion that racial differences may be a legitimate cause to restrict human freedom.

REFERENCES TO RACE

It is in the *Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the Modern World* that the conciliar doctrine about race reaches its full scope. This Constitution contains many direct and indirect references to race, although it does not consider the racial problem itself among the concrete questions treated in the last part of the document. In order to make the position clear, we may divide these statements in three groups. Some are purely descriptive of the sad situation prevailing in some parts of the world; others formulate principles; others still deal with the practical application of these principles as they help to determine moral norms of thought and behaviour.

1. First group of texts—The Council duly notes that contradictory forces are now at odds in the world:

'Whereas the world becomes so conscious of its oneness and of the inter-dependence of all men in a necessary solidarity, it is violently torn asunder by opposing forces that fight each other: there still persist sharp political, social, economic, racial and ideological dissensions, and the danger of a war that could annihilate everything remains' (n.4, 4). 'Important

imbalances appear also between races, between social categories, between wealthy, less wealthy and poor countries.' (n.8, 4).

2. Second group—Since the Constitution is primarily concerned with modern social problems, it lays down principles that should regulate the consideration and eventually the solution of these problems. Some of them apply to racial questions, even when they do not mention these specifically.

ONTOLOGICAL UNITY

A first principle, which has already been mentioned in relation to other conciliar documents, is that of the ontological unity of the human race, the only 'race' which has theological status:

'God, who has fatherly concern for everyone, has willed that all men should constitute one family and treat one another in a spirit of brotherhood. For, having been created in the image of God, who 'from one man created the whole human race and made them live all over the face of the earth' (Acts, 17:26). All men are called to one and the same goal, namely God himself' (n.24).

This ontological unity is manifested in the universal scope of Redemption. And since the Church constitutes the organ of salvation, the Council sees her as the fore-taste of the true unity of mankind:

'By virtue of her mission of enlightening the whole universe with the Gospel message, and of uniting all men in one Spirit, to whatever nation, race or culture they belong, the Church appears as a sign of that brotherhood which makes possible and strengthens loyal dialogue' (n.92).

Yet it is not enough to teach the supernatural unity of man. The principles of a human social order also require the acknowledgement that all men are one even at the natural level, and the duty of society to embody this oneness in its organisations and its institutions.

'The social nature of man shows that the progress of the human person and the advance of society itself hinge on one another. The human person, which, by its very nature, stands in absolute need of social life, is and must be the principle, the subject and the end of all institutions' (n.25).

Speaking more specifically of the economic life of nations, the Council also notes the priority of the human person:

'The fundamental goal of production is not the sole multiplication of goods, profit or power; it is the service of man: of the entire man, according to the hierarchy of his material needs and to the requirements of his intellectual, moral, spiritual and religious

life; of every man and of every group of men, whatever their race or their continent.' (n.64).

From the fundamental principle of the supremacy of the human person, another principle follows: the human person implies all actually living human beings. It therefore demands the social expression of their solidarity, unity and equality before the law. Accordingly, 'Each group must take account of the needs and the legitimate aspirations of other groups and also of the common good of the entire human family' (6.26).

3. Third group—The principles that have been stated entail a series of applications to the actual situations of men and to their mutual relationships in society. In the first place, so-called racial differences are irrelevant when it comes to social intercourse and to the legal standing of every man in the moral, political and juridical order. 'Coming down to practical and particularly urgent consequences, the Council lays stress on respect for man: each one must consider his neighbour, without exception, as another self, must above all take account of his existence and of the means that are necessary for him to live with dignity' (n.27). Awareness of this solidarity and of the fundamental identity of all men has been increasing in modern times: 'There is a growing awareness of the eminent dignity of the human person, which stands above all things and whose rights and duties are universal and inviolable' (n.26).

DIRECT CONDEMNATION

Yet such an awareness is not yet embodied in the constitutions and laws of all nations. And even where the laws are adequate many human failures still stand in the way of their correct application. The Council enumerates some of these faults against human dignity, several of which are related to various forms of racial discrimination or segregation:

'Whatever is opposed to life itself, such as any type of murder, genocide, abortion, euthanasia or willful self-destruction; whatever violates the integrity of the human person, such as mutilation, physical or moral torture, psychological constraint; whatever violates human dignity, such as sub-human living conditions, arbitrary imprisonment, deportation, slavery, the traffic in women and children, or else disgraceful working conditions where men are treated as mere tools for profit, taking no account of their free and responsible personality: all these things and others like them are truly infamous' (n.27).

Facing such situations, the Council clearly teaches that 'every form of discrimination concerning the fundamental rights of the human person, be it social or cultural, based on sex, race, skin pigmentation, social



condition, language or religion, must be overcome and eliminated as contrary to God's design' (n.29).

In a selection which is of course far from exhaustive, the Council mentions the right to culture as likely to suffer from racial discrimination:

'Since we now have the possibility of freeing most men from the plague of ignorance, one duty is particularly opportune in our days, especially for Christians: the duty to work untiringly so that in economic and political questions, both at the national and the international levels, fundamental decisions be made to have the right to culture and its effective achievement be acknowledged everywhere and for all men, in keeping with the dignity of the human person, without distinction of race, sex, nation, religion or social condition' (n.60).

And among the activities that may contribute to fostering good relations among people of all races and nations, special mention is made of athletic competitions, 'which help to establish fraternal relations among men of all conditions, of all nations and of different races' (n.61). But there is no set of activities that holds the key to a solution of the current problems and difficulties. Mankind's resources must be marshalled to fight all forms of discrimination, which effectively debase the human person in many human beings: 'Human institutions, both private and public, must labour to minister to the dignity and purpose of man. They must put up a stubborn fight against any kind of slavery, whether social or political, and must safeguard the basic rights of man under every political system' (n.29). That private and public institutions have specially grave duties in this field does not remove responsibility from individuals. For all men must contribute to the uprooting of prejudices, racial or otherwise:

'The citizens should foster love for their country with magnanimity and loyalty, but without narrowness of mind, that is, in such a way that at the same time they always have in view the good of all the human family, which gathers races, peoples and nations, united by all sorts of ties' (n.75).

CONCLUSIONS

This survey of the references to racial questions in the constitutions, decrees and declarations of the Vatican Council enables us to draw the following conclusions concerning the Catholic doctrine about race:

1. The only race which the Catholic Church recognises as corresponding to God's design on man is the human race as such, in its totality, grouping together in unity all men and groups of men without exception.
2. The popular concept of race, founded on skin pig-

mentation and characteristic features, has no standing in Christian anthropology. It should therefore be disregarded by Christians in their relations with other men. To let awareness of colour affect our relationships to others is not only the result of unjustified prejudice; it also contradicts the divine purpose for man.

3. The faithful should support private and public institutions which promote social justice, and particularly the justice which upholds the equality of all men regardless of their colour, sex, culture, history, nationality or religion. They should likewise withdraw support from public or private institutions which contradict this social justice.

4. It follows that all forms of racial prejudice, segregation, discrimination, apartheid, policy of separate development for distinct races, are condemned in their very principle by the Catholic Church. This condemnation extends much further and reaches much deeper than injustices resulting from the application of such policies or from the shortcomings of practical individual behaviour. It defines the Catholic faithful as actually discovering the norms of his social relations in the nation of Catholicity rather than in the narrow confines of human particularisms and provincialisms. It also shows the Catholic faith as implying a theological concept of man which undercuts all attempts to divide mankind into rival groups and to attribute privileged functions and rights to any one group of men.

Insofar as the equality of all men is already achieved in the spiritual nature of the Church, the Catholic Church stands at the advanced point of the march of mankind toward an order of full justice. Insofar as surviving prejudices, misinformation, lack of theological education or opportunist attitudes still affect the behaviour of her members in their relations with people of other colours and features, the Church is victimized by her own children and cannot give to the world the witness which she knows she must give. Vatican Council II, however, constitutes an important landmark in the Church's progress toward better fidelity to the Saviour of all men, and in that of mankind toward universal fraternity. ●

Modern Theology for the Layman

THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN of today feels the need for a complete new approach to his own religion and to religion in general. He feels sincerely that old standards are going. There is in the air a craving for freedom, a desire to live one's religious life more personally. The layman questions the wisdom of the laws of the Church; and of many religious practices. He hates all regimentation, cannot be happy with the way in which his parents and grandparents lived their religious life—that simple submission to all sorts of religious practices and devotions and the guidance of the priest. He objects to the dogmatic statements: this is mortal sin, this is venial sin; to the attitude of doing special things in order 'to gain more grace' or 'indulgences'. Some words, like 'mortification', 'penance', 'abstinence', 'humility', evoke a feeling of frustration in him. He often disagrees with the way in which religion is taught, in the catholic schools, in the catechism classes, in the sermons of the priest.

Yet all this criticism and dissatisfaction does not spring from any shallowness of living or any disbelief in the religious life. It is rather due to the consciousness of the modern layman, that there is a deeper dimension to our religious life, and that all that regimentation and meticulous fulfilment of little orders and practices prevents rather than helps him to reach that deeper dimension. What he longs for is a personal relationship with God, that is not tied by all sorts of conditions and regulations. He wishes his prayer to be a simple dialogue with God so that he does not get confused and lose his confidence that God hears him, because he has not been to Mass on Sunday or because according to the laws of Church he is in a 'state of mortal sin'. He does not want any formalism in prayer because it distracts him from a direct and more intimate approach. What he seeks is to reach out to God in his own personal way. He realises that this must go through Revelation, in which God tells about Himself, and through the Church, which acts as an intermediary between him and God, but this intermedium must not become a harness, so that the freedom of his approach is lost. That is why occasionally he strains at the doc-

trines he must believe or the commandments he must fulfil. Somehow, he feels that, if he revolts, he may break out of the harness and find his freedom.

Therefore, though undoubtedly we are conscious that there is a crisis in the religious life of our Catholic layman, we do not have to plunge ourselves into the depths of despair, because there are signs enough to show that this crisis may lead to a kind of religious life, which gains in depth and interiority what it loses in exterior expansion. This religious crisis is not to be seen in isolation. It is in reality part of a crisis in which the whole world is involved, the world of which we ourselves form an integral part.

With an evergrowing socialization the world is becoming more and more a technical world; it is falling into the grip of the scientists who make it a fast-moving but often relentless machine, in which man as an individual loses his significance. Whenever there is a flaw in this technical perfection, thousands of people suffer at once in an unavoidable chain-reaction. Man is made so dependent on that technical constellation which is our world today, that he cannot be himself; that of necessity he is more led than leading; he has been made one of the mob. So many think today that this world can no longer rotate perfectly, unless man is reduced to an impersonal 'one', who is obedient in doing the task that is allotted to him, who has no longer any desire of his own, whose opinion is that of the mob, who does things because 'others' do it, who drifts along with every movement of the mob. He lives in a fallen state.

Against such a de-personalisation of man, however, there is growing resistance. Man wants to be himself, he demands his freedom, in which he brings his own possibilities into actuality. He asks himself continually: What am I? Who am I?, and it is thus that modern man, in revolt to this growing de-personalisation, turns his mind to the very ground of his existence. I am not a sheep belonging to a herd, I am not like an animal which is determined by its nature, I am not like other beings. I am 'I', a person. I was thrust into existence, but in such a way that I have to take that existence

upon myself; I have to 'make' myself, I have received a mandate to be, a task of being. I can go out in any direction; I have possibilities in me which I must bring into actuality.

It was thus that the philosophy of existentialism was born; it grew out of reaction against the grip which technology had on our world through the sciences. The existentialist does not condemn the sciences, he appreciates what the sciences are doing. They make the world fit for us to live in, they give us the means to reach our existential ends. But it must be a world-for-us; man must remain the master, not the slave. He must be able to be himself, to fulfil the purpose of his existence.

Science comes to its knowledge through abstraction and deduction, by seeking what is universal in the things, and it is thus the scientist is able to understand the nature of things, their properties and qualities and use them to our advantage.

But the scientist goes wrong when he applies this method of acquiring knowledge to man as well, exclusively, so that by abstraction and deduction you come to the knowledge of that which is universal in man, what all men have in common; because then you come to a de-personalised man, to a human nature, and you suppress all that is most individual in him. The scientist looks for the essence of man and neglects his existence.

CONSCIOUSNESS OF BEING

The existentialist finds that there is another knowledge of man, namely the *consciousness of his being*, the consciousness of himself as a person who exists. In order to uncover this knowledge we must not again start abstracting and deducting, but on the contrary, bring the experience of our existence, the phenomenon, to the surface of our consciousness. All that is hidden and suppressed in our daily way of existence, must be made to appear before us, so that the experience of our existence becomes a conscious experience. This experience, this phenomenon, is often hidden and suppressed and by bringing it out into the open, we can discover a lot about ourselves. To give an example: What does this existence mean? It is really an *ex-istere*, setting out, a self-projection into the world; we are really irrevocably bound up with the world, we can not *be* except by projecting ourselves into the world, giving it meaning, making it a world-for-us, and while we change the world—are in dialogue with the world, as we say—we are at the same time changing ourselves, turning our possibilities into actualities. Another example is our co-existence. Our being is a being-with-the-other.

Whatever we do, we are always completing a meaning which another has already applied to the thing; e.g. when we close a door to have privacy, we complete the sense of the carpenter who made the door. By bringing such phenomena to the surface of our consciousness, we discover that our existence is really a co-existence, a living with the other as co-subjects in our self-projection.

This method of bringing the phenomenon which was hidden or suppressed to the surface of our consciousness, is called phenomenology. The philosophy itself, the knowledge which we acquire, is existentialism; the method we apply is phenomenology.

By this phenomenologic approach we learn to live an authentic life, to be ourselves; we refuse to be one of the mob, a de-personalised 'one'. It is thus that man as a person can stand before the world, brought to technical perfection by science, and still remain master, using it to make himself.

We can now understand how eagerly the modern theologian takes up this phenomenological approach for the better understanding of the religious life of man. Up till now religion was explained in abstract and universal terms—the scientific way—and came to abstract definitions and universal dogmas. For instance, in the matter of the interpersonal relationship which we have with God, theology stopped short when it had given the definition of sanctifying grace and of all the different graces auxiliary to it, but it never told how this grace affects *me* personally, how I can discover the working of grace in me.

Modern theology however makes use of the phenomenologic approach. Here is a phenomenon: we experience a relationship with God, all we have to do then is to bring it to the surface of our consciousness. For faith is doing something to us, it breaks out in all sorts of thoughts and spontaneous acts in our daily life, in our reactions to our peculiar situation in which we are placed. We have therefore plenty of religious experiences. And if we make them appear before us, just as they arise, if we make ourselves conscious of all that remains so often hidden behind a matter-of-fact acting, we suddenly discover that we live with God, that there is a constant dialogue between Him and us, that in our faith He speaks to us, and in our faith we answer, that we are always busy with Him, because we live with Him.

The phenomenologic approach is therefore not so much out to teach about God as to *taste* Him. It is only when we reflect upon how we live with God, that we begin to be aware of what exactly we believe, and then come to the conclusions which dogmatic theology has given us in definition. ●

Since 1964 the *Theology Correspondence Course* has published two parts of a three year course in this modern theology according to the existential—phenomenologic approach. The third part began on the 1st April. It is an entirely new course, which replaces the original course according to the Thomistic doctrine (1955-64). But it serves very well as a supplementary course for those who did the old one. Priests also will find the course very interesting and helpful in their modern apostolate.

Laymen who found the first course rather heavy going need not be afraid that this course will be too difficult too. This article can serve as a test; if he finds this article easy to follow, he will have no difficulty with the course, because it is written in the same vein.

The costs of the course—done by new students in the ordinary way, with set-work corrections, examinations at the end of each year, and a diploma at the end of each course, will be R6.00 per year (£3) with R1 at the end of the year for examination fees. Priests and old students of the first course, who do not want to write setwork or examination, can have the course for three rand. Anyone who is interested should write to *Theology Correspondence Course, Box 591, Welkom, O.F.S.*

Letters

U.D.I.

Sir,—Having been able to study most of the literature that has been written about the Rhodesian U.D.I. in Europe I feel I must write to you about the Editorial in your December issue. This appears to me to make wholly unfair assumptions and to draw wholly erroneous conclusions.

May I say at the start that I have always opposed U.D.I. for the reason you mention in your second paragraph, namely that it could intensify a division of the world into 'haves' and 'have nots' but, however much we may regret it, is it not fairly clear to every thinking person that this division is already with us and is growing wider year by year?

As one who knows Africa fairly well and visits various parts of that Continent every year, I think it is wholly unfair to suggest that by U.D.I. Rhodesia has lost the last chance to evolve without racial prejudice and has threatened independent countries to the North. Any person reading your Editorial would take it for

granted that all African countries are enjoying stable and democratic government and yet surely we know that the true picture is quite different—that eight independent African governments have been overthrown by force within the last nine months and that great statesmen like Sir Abubakar Balewa were tortured before being murdered?

I have always found race relations best in Portuguese territories, after which I would put Rhodesia and I am convinced, from a recent visit in January this year, that the the large majority of Africans now support Mr. Smith's government. The reason for this may be material rather than moral, for example decrease in taxation, ending of intimidation, the fear of the Chiefs of an African Nationalist government, but nonetheless true.

Your appeal for a rapid advance to multi-racial democratic government which would attract capital surely has to be seen in the context of the past few years of African history. It is now difficult to name one democratic government in Africa if by democratic we mean rule with the obvious consent of the majority. Certainly very few, except in Southern Africa, are attracting much outside investment. Equally few, if any, can be called multi-racial for it is also a fact, however much we may deplore it, that once the Africans gain a majority in Parliament they exercise complete domination first in the political field and then attempt to do the same in the economic field.

I do not blame them, if I was an African I would probably do the same, but having done so I would have to take the economic consequences.

Finally may I turn to your extraordinary suggestion that the British Government has acted with great restraint and that it would be the duty of South Africa to support mandatory oil sanctions if the U.N. were so foolish to call for such action. The policy of economic sanctions has never worked and I do not believe that Rhodesia will prove the exception.

If mandatory sanctions did work then the Afro-Asian bloc in the U.N. would immediately apply them to South Africa and Portugal in order to overthrow the governments of these countries. From reading your Editorial one almost gets the impression that this would have your approval! In suggesting that U.D.I. has delayed the economic progress of independent African states I would suggest that the real reason for any delay is the political instability of almost every African independent state which makes any suggestion of these states interfering in Rhodesia too absurd to contemplate.

I feel that your advocacy of one of the most extreme

positions I have yet read does no credit to a Catholic magazine which should, I would have thought, be expected to take a reasonably balanced view.

PATRICK WALL, *Westminster*.
(Mr. Wall is a Conservative M.P. in the House of Commons.)

CELIBACY

Sir,—In the February issue of CHALLENGE Mrs. J. Stewart takes me to task for an article by me on the shortage of vocations, published in the SOUTHERN CROSS some months before. I am sure she will not mind my replying.

In the beginning she admits that I said that the shortage is due 'to some degree' to parental opposition but at the end of her letter she states 'therefore we cannot agree with Fr. de Burgh's views that the lack of vocations are due to parental influence *only*' (Italics mine.). I certainly did not blame all parents or parents only. From long years of experience as a director of vocations I know there are many other reasons also.

Mrs. Stewart deftly switches the argument to celibacy and makes a number of statements against it which could be heartily challenged. I feel, for example, that she has not got an adequate idea of the priestly training. A young man is not finally committed to celibacy until he reaches the subdiaconate, and at any time in the years of training before that he may leave the seminary without disgrace or stigma. All along the line, in fact, he receives adequate guidance from his superiors, who would be the very first to advise him kindly to leave if he should show any signs of instability and they will definitely help him find a more suitable career. It is a fact that more students leave the seminaries than those who are eventually ordained and the weeding-out process is an amiable arrangement on both sides. At any rate, by the time he reaches the subdiaconate the seminarist will be at the very least 23 years old, probably older, and surely by then capable of a mature decision about his vocation. Moreover, it is not as though he has led such a sheltered life that he is unaware of the possible dangers of sex and social life.

For some considerable time now seminaries have been run on the far more modern lines advocated by recent popes. Seminarists are no longer entirely cloistered but they are able to have regular holidays at home, mix freely in social life and, in short, can and should develop a normal, sensible attitude to the opposite sex. As I say, the final decision will never come before 23 at least—and by that time very many other young men are already married! I read recently the statement that the majority of divorces occur amongst those who marry

under 25. And yet how easily the same parents who fear for their son's happiness in the priesthood will allow him their fullest blessing to marry quite early and with far less guarantees of stability and happiness! Marriage is (or should be) so final—God's law!—whereas celibacy is only a Church law and could be changed, and exceptions have been made.

As freely as Mrs. Stewart asserts that there is no critical shortage of clergy amongst other denominations because 'they are able to live a normal balanced life' (marriage) so I deny it, for I have read the very opposite over and over again, especially re: Anglicans—and by their own statement. Moreover, celibacy does not, as she maintains, 'force the priest to be detached from human love'. It certainly does not de-humanise us and it is possible to have true human affection without the sex element.

'Are men more inclined to confide in celibate priests? On the contrary . . . penitents seem to favour the priest with a wife' (Mrs. Stewart). I wonder on what she bases these and other free statements? With all the recent discussions re: celibacy, I can state from my own experience that many lay people have assured me of the very opposite. Even without being married, a priest can 'share the same sufferings, joys and even weaknesses' of others and from the vast experience gained by trying to be 'all things to all men' he finds over and over again that people come to him most trustfully to open their hearts—and not in the least bit scared that the missus will try and get it out of him afterwards!

I do not deny everything that Mrs. Stewart says re: celibacy, but in any case it is possible that the Church may some day revise her laws about it. At the moment her law for the priesthood in general is as final and as reasonable as that for marriage: think well on it, test yourself well, get sensible advice and guidance before you plunge into it, and then be generous with God in trying to keep your solemn promises. Thanks be to God, falls in the priesthood because of celibacy are generally very few and compare most favourably with the alarming rate of divorces amongst even Catholics who commit themselves so finally to marriage at a much earlier age than any young man is allowed to do to the celibate priesthood.

FR. DAVID DE BURGH, S.D.B., *Johannesburg*.

FR. COLIN COLLINS is a regular contributor to CHALLENGE.

FR. GEORGE TAVARD, a recognised authority on Ecumenism, is deeply involved in the debate in the United States over American policy in Vietnam. He visited South Africa recently.

FR. G. M. A. JANSEN O.P., is the editor of the *Theological Correspondence Course* which the Dutch Dominicans publish in South Africa. Political comment and sub-editing in this issue by A. P. Goller of 703 Caroldene, Soper Road, Berea, Johannesburg.

PUBLISHED BY THE EDITOR, A. P. GOLLER, 703 CAROLDENE, SOPER ROAD, BEREA, JOHANNESBURG AND PRINTED BY SHERRY & SHERRY IPTY LTD., 52 MARLBOROUGH ROAD, SPRINGFIELD, JOHANNESBURG — 73966

10/11/13
Ed
hl

19 AUG 1966
SOUTH AFRICA
LIBRARY



challenge

QUESTIONS—AND ANSWERS?

DO WE ALL STAND in danger of economic determinism, of having opted out of moral evaluation of our society? To what extent will the future of South Africa be determined by economic factors? To what extent can we rely on economic trends to bring about alleviation of our most pressing problems? Can the establishment of priorities be left to the free play of impersonal economic forces or the jockeying for position of organised pressure groups? Is there no clash between the claims of economic expansion and the development of social services? Is there any correlation between the quantity of our economic production and the quality of the uses to which it is put? In economic terms, must South Africa retain its unitary structure to provide a reasonable standard of living for all its people? Is a degree of controlled inflation to be ruled out even if it could bring about a fairer distribution of wealth? Can South Africa, already the most state-controlled economy in Africa south of the Sahara, transform its national socialism into democratic socialism, based on the consent of the people? Does it want to? Should dying industries, like the gold mines, be nationalised, or merely new growth industries?

Does Parliament as presently constituted represent all economic groups in such a way that we can expect just solutions or even genuine compromises? How many trade unionist M.P.s are there? How many M.P.s representing white farmers? Should workers be directly represented in Parliament? Is the corporatist state a solution or does it merely perpetuate vested interests?

Is full employment a conscious aim of our society, to the extent that it can determine the use of limited resources? Is the worker more important than the goods or services he produces? Is he an economic serf or does he have the right to withhold his labour, to strike? Is collective bargaining essential to the achievement of a living wage? Is it essential to the sharing in increased wealth? Is it possible to build a prosperous nation without using to the full the talents of all? How

An Independent Review

EDITED BY CATHOLIC LAYMEN

Volume Three AUGUST 1966 Number Three

ROSE MOSS
Dan Jacobson's 'The Beginners'

JEROME SMITH
Free Speech in the Church

EDWARD HIGGINS
Odds and Sods

+ BODE WEGERIF
For the Record

COLIN COLLINS
African Family Life

PAUL GOLLER
A Democrat among the Republicans

PETER WALSH
The Church and the Layman

AFRICAN ART FROM MARIANNHILL

CHALLENGE
P.O. BOX 5015, JOHANNESBURG
SUBSCRIPTION: R1 p.a. (post free)

15 cents

Ut omnes unum sint

widely is it known that R2 a day was the slogan of white workers more than forty years ago?

Is the welfare state our goal? Does it sap the initiative of the individual? Would the European miners of Zambia agree that it does? Is it possible to raise standards of living without cutting back the standards of the most conspicuous consumers? Should the level of taxes be increased punitively? Will any political party even advocate this?

Can any Christian still believe that the free interplay of economic forces will result in a just society? Do Christian attitudes towards private property have any relevance? What, in fact, did St. Thomas teach? What are different Protestant attitudes towards wealth in its personal and social aspects? Is it possible to exercise a genuine charity without reference to its social context? Do we all stand convicted of economic determinism, of refusing to evaluate our society morally.

Or are we asking the wrong questions?

VYF GESEËNDE JARE

'DIE REPUBLIEK VAN Suid-Afrika werp 'n terugblik oor vyf geseënde jare. Die voorspellings van die onheilsprofete van vyf jaar gelede is op gedugte wyse geloënstraf, en trots roep ons die grootste ekonomiese bloeiperiode wat Suid-Afrika nog ooit geken het, in herinnering. Die verlede is met welslae bekroon. Die toekoms sien rooskleurig daaruit. Ons het dus alle rede om fees te vier. Ons feestelikhede sal egter vir ons geen intekenis inhou, as ons nie bereid sou wees om—al is dit net maar enkele oomblikke—tyd aan nadenking af te staan nie.'

No translation could do justice to the insulting tone, smugness, arrogance and insincere 'humility' of this lead paragraph to an unsigned article in the June issue of the Catholic monthly Die Brug. It insults the intelligence of its readers who know, to take one example at random, that the amount spent per head on African education in the decade of which 'five blessed years' form the golden-age has decreased absolutely in a period of inflation. Still more it insults the daily experience of 80% of our people (not to be confused with 'die volk') whose dignity is denied, whose security is destroyed, whose talents are thwarted, whose spirits are distorted and whose Christian meekness is wilfully 'patronised' and degraded. Here is one example of the complete abdication from all moral values in favour of an inhuman economic determinism which smacks of the Communist hack who has lost whatever idealism he once possessed.

APARTHEID IN THE CHURCH

'There is certainly no doubt that apartheid is firmly rooted in the Church (in South Africa); that most white Christians including a large number of the clergy support government policy, a few of them openly, the majority tacitly by their indifference, selfishness and greed. There is no doubt also that many of them would leave the churches if any attempt were made to re-educate them or to integrate parish activities; but it seems to me we must be prepared to accept this and even to escort them cheerfully from the premises since they have obviously closed their ears to the message of the Gospel. As it is, thousands of Africans are turning away from the faith in disgust. Already the Church is in danger of losing a whole generation of young Africans.

Thus Fr. Malcolm Magee, O.P., whom we wish had had the courage and wisdom to speak out openly before he left South Africa.

challenge

(every second month)

SUBSCRIPTION FORM

P.O. Box 5015 Johannesburg

Please write in block letters

Please enrol me as a subscriber/renew my subscription from the

Issue

Name

Address

I enclose cheque/postal order/note for R1.00

Rose Moss

Dan Jacobson's 'The Beginners'

DAN JACOBSON HAS ALREADY written some of the finest novels to come out of South Africa, so American reviews of *The Beginners*, which have ranged from considerably tempered praise to ill-tempered accusation, came as a surprise. All the American reviews I have read criticize the novel for failing to deal more forcefully with what appears here to be the most crucial element of life in South Africa—apartheid. At first I was unsympathetic to this criticism. Americans involuntarily simplify and distort South African issues as they attempt to assimilate them to American issues, and mere distance contributes to the impression that people living under apartheid lose their mundane, familial humanity because they are totally engrossed in or afflicted by intemperate totalitarian cruelty. But *The Beginners* is the saga of a Jewish family who emigrated from Lithuania at the turn of the century and scatter again in the fifties, some remaining in South Africa, some beginning again in England and in Israel, and there seemed no great need to drag in apartheid by the hind hooves merely because it is supposed to bedevil the whole country.

Focussing where it does, *The Beginners* gives an unprecedentedly rich impression of South African life. A dense milieu of indubitably South African characters surrounds the Glickman family whose own individual Jewishness abuts on Afrikaners, Africans and English South Africans, each of these, too, are individual, all different from the characters we meet in England and Israel.

In the multiplicity, variety and vividness of minor characters, and occasionally in the vitality which is not wholly congruent with their small role, we recognize Jacobson's debt to Dickens:

John Begbie was a soft, fat, bald man on whom, despite his bulk, clothes always hung or lay too loosely. His trousers were too wide at the ankles, his jacket too long in the sleeves; whenever he could he unbuttoned his collar and pulled down his tie so that the knot hung several inches below his neck. Then he blew out his cheeks with relief. He looked, lolling back, like an ill-wrapped parcel which someone had dumped unceremoniously in a

chair and was unlikely soon to call for again. Protruding from these wrappings was a round face with a pair of blue eyes, surprised and injured in expression, and a small pouting mouth.

But the main characters, the Glickman family, derive from less propitious stock. Avrom Glickman, the first to arrive from Lithuania with his sons, Meyer and Benjamin, is one of those loveable fiction Jews whose unworldliness brings curses from their families and indulgent smiles from the reader—as when, on a journey back to Lithuania to fetch his wife and two younger children, he meets a distressed young Jewess who says that she has lost or been robbed of her money, tickets, and travel documents, and Avrom gives her all the money he has, the fares for his family which have been laboriously saved out of the earnings of Meyer and Benjamin while he has not been able to hold down a job. The figure is familiar to Jewish readers. As far as Jacobson's application of fashionable ambiguity to such reckless generosity—'Avrom himself remained ignorant, would always remain ignorant, of how much revenge against Meyer and Benjamin there was in what he had done. All he was conscious of was a loving-kindness that embraced the women, his sons, and himself, indiscriminately.'—if we say that we are familiar with such psychological smartness, let us not forget familiarity's brat, contempt.

Avrom Glickman's offspring come from the same magazine pages as their father: his sons become prosperous businessmen, his grandchildren receive university educations and are disturbed by the meaninglessness of their lives.

Their mediocrity is not immediately boring. Jacobson deploys his plot with professional skill. His writing is deft, accurate and to a South African peculiarly interesting because he describes so much, so well, that has never or seldom been described. But in the end, or even in the middle, one wonders what significance this saga is supposed to have; whether anything more than a harvest of vivid tidbits is to be gained from reading on; whether some American reviewers who have accused Jacobson of writing *The Beginners* to be a best-seller on the Jewish market are not right after

all, or if they are not, what his purpose in writing this novel could have been.

Part of the purpose, I suspect, was to get it off his chest. Jacobson's other novels are relatively tight-knit, and, although compound, spare. There was an immense amount about South Africa, particularly about its Jewish community, left to be digested. *The Beginners* is carefully articulated, its heterogeneous anecdotes pinned in place, its scenes precisely timed and ordered, but the effect of the whole is unfocussed, blurred and crowded, somewhat like an old fashioned museum from which no curiosity has been omitted.

PUBLIC PURPOSE

A less private part of Jacobson's purpose was to say something about the meaning of life—at least, this is what is implied by the epigraph from the Ethics of the Fathers which is a comment on the title, and the irony of that title in the light of the whole book. The first beginners of the Glickman family in South Africa begin a work that has no conclusion. The family business passes into the hands of Afrikaners; the family remaining in South Africa lead discontented lives; most of the family, including Joel Glickman, the character who comes nearest to being the central character, leave for England and Israel. Their emigration is contrasted with the first journey of the book, Avron Glickman's voyage to fetch his family.

But what they begin again and again we do not know—except that it is Life. And why they must begin again and again is not clear. True, Jacobson's characters find little scope for their ambition or idealism in South Africa; true, they seem intermittently

annoyed by the injustice of a regime like Hitler's Germany; true, sociology supports fiction and we know that people like Jacobson's characters do emigrate from South Africa in droves; but the dominant inward-outward structure of *The Beginners*, the repeated beginnings, seem pointless because the endings they follow and the ends to which they set out seem so irrelevant—even to the actors. Joel Glickman's Zionism, Rachel Glickman's illegitimate child, Benjamin Glickman's business, Sarah Glickman's adult life lived in South Africa, all are given up without much regret. Neither the past, nor hopes of the future, nor the love of a particular place, nor the habit of any particular work, nor their families, nor common sufferings, nor convictions, nor sexual partners mean enough to Jacobson's characters to keep them from sudden changes, breaks, departures, abandoned alliances and promiscuous wandering to and from upon the face of the earth. A palsied coldness of heart afflicts them—and is the one disease for which their creator does not blame them.

In the minor characters, more vividly drawn than the main, Jacobson's coldness occasionally verges on cruelty—especially when they have talent or dedication.

The American reviewers who complain that Jacobson does not come to grips with apartheid are, after all, on to something. His characters cannot respond with vigorous compassion, anger or anguish in a situation which peculiarly demands generosity. One hopes that they are not all the more accurately for that white South Africans. ●

Jerome Smith

Free Speech in the Church

THE CHURCH HAS ALWAYS demanded free speech for herself. Faith is obedience given to God through hearing and obeying the preached Word of God, and for that preaching no human authorization is necessary or even possible, but only a mission from God. 'How then shall they call on him in whom they have not believed? Or how shall they believe him of whom they have not heard? And how shall they hear without a preacher? And how shall they preach unless they be sent . . . ?' Rom. 10, 14. If freedom to proclaim the Word of God is not granted by the secular authorities,

then they are to be ignored and the necessary freedom of speech taken and used, in spite of the danger of punishment. When Peter and John were hauled before the Sanhedrin at Jerusalem a second time the high priest said to them: 'Commanding we commanded you that you should not teach in this name, and behold you have filled Jerusalem with your doctrine, and you have a mind to bring the blood of this man upon us.' Peter replied for the apostles with the abrupt stark saying 'We ought to obey God rather than men.' Ac. 5, 28-29.

From the time of the apostles onwards the Church has never hesitated over this basic freedom of speech which she must claim for herself. There has been far greater unsureness over whether other people should enjoy a like freedom. Once the Roman emperors became Christian non-Christians became suspect, and five hundred years after Constantine, Charlemagne made a habit of offering whole tribes and peoples the choice between baptism or death. This weight of history has left the Church with a rather negative approach to toleration in matters of religion and morals. Pope Pius XII, in his talk to the 1953 Italian national convention of Catholic lawyers, speaks indeed of tolerance, but bases this on the previous carefully negative formulation: 'God reproves them (error and evil), but he allows them to exist. Therefore the statement: Religious and moral deviation must always be prevented so far as is possible, and this because toleration of them is in itself evil—cannot stand in its unconditioned absolute form.'

Pope Pius was speaking in the context of communities of States principally, no doubt, of the Common Market and the United Nations, in which laws of the free exercise of belief and religious and moral practice are to be extended from those States that already have them to the whole community. 'Can it be', he asks, 'that in particular circumstances (God) gives men no mandate, imposes no duty, even grants no right to prevent or repress the erroneous and false? A look at the realities of the case gives an affirmative reply'¹. There can be no doubt that the movement of our times is towards closer and closer international relations, towards a world-wide flow of trade and the free movement of people in search of work, towards the juxtaposition of conflicting beliefs and practices and the formation of mixed societies. That the world is shrinking every year is a cliché of our century; this makes it all the more necessary that the Church should think out her own position.

' . . . in the extraordinary condition of these times' wrote Leo XIII in 1888, 'the Church usually acquiesces in certain modern liberties, not because she prefers them in themselves, but because she judges it expedient to admit them . . .'² It is against this background that Pope Pius' rather cautious approval tolerance should be placed if we are to do him historical justice. Pope Leo's attitude on this point is conditioned by the circumstances of the time. Rome had been occupied by Piedmontere troops during the first Vatican Council, and Pius IX had never accepted the loss of the Papal territories. Leo XIII became Pope eight years after the occupation (1878) and continued

Pius' policy of non-recognition of the King of Italy in Rome. This is the setting for the pronouncements on liberty in *Libertas praesentissimum* quoted above. Pope Leo's teaching on social matters was much more open and forward-looking, and it is for *Rerum Novarum* that he will always be remembered.

Pope John speaks very briefly of free speech and freedom of conscience in *Pacem in terris* but what he does say is marked by his usual note; it is positive, open and optimistic: 'By the natural law every human being has the right . . . to freedom in searching for truth and in expressing and communicating his opinions . . . within the limits laid down by the moral order and the common good; and he has the right to be informed truthfully about public events . . . Every human being has the right to honour God according to the dictates of an upright conscience, and therefore to worship God privately and publicly.'

FAITH, CONSCIENCE AND FREE SPEECH

Christian faith is a total personal commitment to God in Christ reconciling the world to himself (2 Cor. 5, 19), a radical and complete submission to God who speaks to us through Jesus his Word. The only appropriate response to the Word of God that seeks us out is that of Samuel: 'Speak Lord thy servant heareth' (1 Sam. 3, 10) and to those who do so, Jesus has promised 'he who heareth my word and believeth him that sent me hath life everlasting' (Jn. 5, 24). The Word of God, is a compelling Word, Jesus challenges us as one speaking with an authority and power never experienced before in the history of the world (Mk. 1, 22), and yet the response of faith is a leap into the darkness of the unknown God (Jn. 1, 18), at once a gift from God and a fumbling hesitant response to God's call: 'I do believe Lord, help my unbelief' (Mk. 9, 23). God's call is a free gift, and the response is free too, a free, personal, and in one sense solitary, gift of the self back to God the creator who offers to make us over, to recreate us, in Christ (2 Cor. 5, 17).

And yet the Word of God, the challenge of Christ, is mediated to us through a human community: the Church. Christ is the Apostle of the Father, and he has in his turn sent his disciples to speak in his name; the community of his followers is therefore an apostolic Church (Jn. 13, 20). The decision for God, the radical gift of one's existence to God, which is faith, must be constantly renewed, must be worked out in life, and this is only possible in the Spirit-filled community of the Church. The Spirit of Christ is the experience of life in Christ: 'if any man have not the Spirit of Christ he is none of his' (Rom. 8, 9).

There seems at first a sight of tension between the freedom and 'solitariness' of the act of faith and the community side of life in the Church, and at a superficial level this is a fact of experience. But at a more fundamental level we must recognize that it is only in the human community that we discover ourselves as persons and that only there is a growth in personality possible. It is equally true that we exist and grow as redeemed persons only in the redeemed community, the Church. 'You are a chosen generation, a kingly priesthood, a holy nation, a purchased people' (1 Pet. 2, 9). It is the people of God that is purchased, redeemed, in the first place, though of course there is no people unless it is made up of persons. Person and community are correlative, not opposed, terms.

Given that faith is a personal spontaneous reality within the redeemed community, the living out of faith should imply a freedom and spontaneity of personal participation in the life of the believing community. And this is just what we find in the New Testament. At Corinth the enthusiasm and joy of faith bubbled out so spontaneously from every member of the Church that St. Paul had to intervene and try and introduce some sort of order into their meetings. (1 Cor. 14). Openness and confidence of speech, (*parresia*), is a mark of the apostolic Church not only in speaking to those outside, the *parresia* of Peter and John before the Sanhedrin, for example, but also within the Church: when Peter and John return and make their report the Church prays 'And when they had prayed the place was moved wherein they were assembled; and they were filled with the Holy Ghost and they spoke the word of God with confidence' (*parresia*) Ac. 4, 31.

The living out of faith is not only a matter of speaking the Word of God, it is the application of that Word to the circumstances of daily life. In the gospels Jesus constantly refuses to be drawn into casuistic moral discussions so common among the Rabbis; again and again he brings his hearers back to the fundamentals of the moral demands of the Law. St. Paul and the apostolic Church show a similar concern for the moral fundamentals of the law of Christ (Rom. 8, 2). It is only in answer to questions from his converts, or in correction of their mistakes, that St. Paul goes into questions of continence in marriage, eating of meat from the butcher's shop that came originally from the pagan temples, and so on. Otherwise from his first letter, 1 Thessalonians, onwards he prefers to trust in the good judgment of the Christian people: 'Prove all things; hold fast that which is good. From all appearance of evil refrain yourselves' (1 Thess. 5, 21. cf. Rom. 12, 2). This is spoken in the context of testing

and examining the various extraordinary manifestations of the Spirit common in the early Church, but the proverb-form of the sayings supports a quite general meaning, confirmed by Romans 12, 2.

At Corinth the experience of Christian freedom was so intoxicating (freedom from the Law, freedom from the oppression of sin, freedom from the prospect of death without hope), that some were taking a saying (probably of St. Paul's): 'All things are lawful to me' as a pretext for undisciplined and immoral living, gluttony and free love. Paul's response is not a list of detailed don'ts, but an attempt to persuade them that their bodies are holy: 'the body is not for uncleanness but for the Lord, and the Lord for the body. Know you not that your bodies are the members of Christ.'

In all these documents of the early Church there is an unmistakable spirit of liberation of mind and independence of judgment: everyone has his say (1 Cor. 14, 26) no-one is bound by the decisions of anyone else's conscience (1 Cor. 10, 28-9). On the other hand there is a true objective knowledge that proceeds from faith (which should never therefore be an occasion for pride, for faith is sheer gift), and in the exercise of the free choice of conscience one must acknowledge the fundamental moral demands of God and reckon with the state of one's neighbour's conscience, in all charity and peaceableness. (1 Cor. 8.)³

TRUE FUNCTION

The true function of freedom of speech and spontaneity of action is not that of placing oneself outside the Church, defying the teaching and discipline of the Church except where it happens to coincide with one's own point of view; freedom is rather a basic condition of fully personal, fully committed, participation in the life of the Church. Christian freedom of conscience, and of speech and action expressing this, is always a freedom in Christ and in the Church. It is within this framework that St. Thomas' teaching on the primacy of conscience ('the vital point of Christianity' as Cardinal Tisserant has called it),⁴ should be understood.

The early mediaeval theologians had felt very great hesitation about admitting the primacy of conscience. They were willing to admit that you must follow your conscience in indifferent matters, i.e. in actions not right or wrong in themselves but only as circumstances or intentions make them so, but they could not see that you must follow conscience even when it is mistaken in matters good and evil in themselves, and therefore good and evil in the divine law.⁵ They could not see that a Thug who robs and murders without scruple of conscience out of devotion to the goddess Khali is subjectively right to do so.

St. Thomas was from the first clear that you had to follow your conscience even where it is mistaken, he was not at first sure that you were thereby excused from evil. He thought that the man whose conscience told him to do something on the grounds that it was good, whereas in fact it is evil, sins in either case, whether he does it or does not do it.⁶ Further thought on this question, however, led St. Thomas to see that you must, simply speaking, follow your conscience, if your conscience is right your actions are good, if your conscience is mistaken, genuinely mistaken through no fault of your own, then your actions are still good, from a subjective moral point of view.⁷

God wills that all men should follow their conscience, but also that they should come to a knowledge of the truth. In the Church it is his will that we should always obey his Word, so far as it is known to us, but also that we should come to know his Word truly, both subjectively and objectively, to know his Word addressed to me here and now in its fullness, without barriers of pride, weakness or simple ignorance. In her theology the Church has always laid great emphasis on the objective Word of God, this has led her to elaborate her teaching and create a whole corpus of moral theology and casuistry. In all this the primacy of conscience in actual Christian living is sometimes lost sight of. Where it is reckoned with it is often considered sufficient that people should obey the Church's teaching without any serious attempt to understand how and why this teaching in any particular matter truly represents the Word of God. This, where it exists, is a dangerous policy, it reduces us to the status of children once again, the status, according to St. Paul, of those under the Law who do not yet possess the freedom of sonship in Christ. (Gal. 4, 1-7).

COMMON CONSENT AND PUBLIC OPINION

I do not for one moment mean to suggest that we are not bound by the Church's teaching unless we can follow some line of narrowly logical deduction from Scripture, that the Church must produce some scholastic proof of her teaching before she calls on us to accept it. 'As the rain and the snow come down from heaven, and return no more thither, but soak the earth, and make it fruitful and to spring, and give seed to the sower and bread to the eater, so shall my Word be, which shall go forth from my mouth; it shall not return to me void, but it shall do whatsoever I please and shall prosper in the things for which I sent it 'as Isaias says. (55, 10-11). The Word of God, given to his Church, is all power and fruitfulness; we stand under the judgment of the Word, we do not submit it to our own. Yet

the Word, even the living Word and Son of the Father, is a communication to the Church, and the whole Church must be active in receiving and apprehending this Word. Because the Spirit of truth who leads us into all truth (Jn. 16, 13) is given to the Church, the hearing, the understanding, the preaching of the Word belongs to us all. The Apostles, the Pope and the Bishops have a special teaching function, but the distinction between the Church teaching and the Church taught is not a rigid one; all collaborate in the work of teaching and all are taught.

This has been emerging more clearly over the last century. Before the definition of the dogma of the Immaculate Conception in 1854 Pope Pius IX had investigations made through the Bishops into the beliefs of lay people on the subject.⁸ It is true that when Newman wrote the famous article '*On consulting the faithful in matters of doctrine*' with reference to this, he was delated to Rome for his pains, and remained under suspicion there for some years as a consequence.⁹ But in 1949, in preparation for the definition of the Assumption of Mary, Pius XII asked the Bishops of the whole world whether they thought the Assumption could be defined, and asked further 'Is it your desire, and that of your clergy and of your people?' 94% answered and 98% of those said yes to both questions. Pius commented, in the Bull *Munificentissimus* that defined the dogma: 'This common consent is of itself an absolutely certain proof, admitting no error, that the privilege in question is a truth revealed by God . . .'¹⁰

PIUS XII

In an address to Catholic journalists in 1950 Pius XII spoke more generally about public opinion in the Church: 'We would add here one word more about public opinion concerning the Church's own household. We are referring, of course, to matters that remain open to free discussion. What we say will be no cause for surprise save to those who either do not know the Church or are ill-informed. The Church is a living body. Hence there would be something wanting to her life if public opinion were lacking: and this would be a defect with harmful consequences both to pastors and faithful.'¹¹

In spite of this clear statement from Pope Pius public opinion has been very muted on all those subjects that matter most and are still open to decision: the reform and rejuvenation of the Church, her place in the contemporary world, problems of marriage, the population explosion, the shocking difference in living standards between rich and poor nations, and so on. The succession of Pope John brought a new atmosphere of

kindness, love and freedom; as well as his summoning of a Council to bring the Church up to date.

Attempts were made in preparation for the Council to consult the ideas, hopes and opinions of all members of the Church. Thick volumes summarizing the replies of the Bishops were printed in Rome. Lay people were consulted in many dioceses, and Bishops gave farewell sermons in their cathedrals on the eve of the Council stating that they went both as successors of the apostles and as spokesmen for the faith of their own local churches. But still there were many hesitations and many bishops felt great timidity in view of their own limited knowledge and in face of the formidable apparatus of thought control still so powerful in Rome. A number of bishops have written of the experiences of the first days: of how little groups of bishops met in corners and spoke cautiously and very quietly of what they hoped for, yet scarcely dared hope; of how their confidence grew with force of numbers and under the unmistakable encouragement of Pope John, and the Council discovered a freedom of speech not heard even from bishops since the time of Trent at least.

Freedom of speech has been won for the Bishops, it is a necessary accompaniment of collegiate rule, whatever form that will take, and of decentralisation. But if the work of the Council is really to be carried through, and is to engage the life commitment of all members of the Church, decentralisation and freedom of discussion must not stop there, what the bishops have won for themselves they must hand on to others, though always respecting the difference of function in the Church.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion it may be useful to state briefly the special contribution that the extension of freedom of conscientious discussion to all might make to the renewal of the life of the Church. Bishop De Smedt of Bruges, in his famous speech on the *schema* on the Church in the first session of the Council, diagnosed three diseases that need cure: triumphalism, clericalism, juridicism.¹² A fuller recognition of the function of the witness of Christian conscience and faith within the Church would help with all of these.

In a prophetic moment Pope Pius XII, speaking to the new Cardinals of 1946, said of the lay people: 'They are the Church.'¹³ If this prophecy (which is also of course a factual statement) is to reach fulfilment lay people must have a much wider scope of work within the Church. And if this work is to be intelligent, if it is to be in a full sense *their* work, its

form and method must be thrashed out in common discussion. Naturally Bishops and priests will still have a guiding function, but this must be performed in a spirit of generosity; there must be plenty of scope for initiative, and people must be allowed to learn through their own mistakes. And if clericalism, as a major force in the life of the Church at a sociological and real level, disappears, we may hope for the disappearance of anti-clericalism too.

Juridicism in the Church is by no means confined to canon lawyers, or even to the clergy. The Roman emphasis on custom, law and discipline has been stamped on all our minds and sensibilities. Freedom of discussion and of participation in the life of the Church would come to nothing if it simply meant an orgy of legalistic argument on the part of lay people too. The best way of ensuring that juridicism really goes out will be a new respect, on the part of everyone, for the spontaneity of the working of the Holy Spirit in others.

But it is in relation to triumphalism that common discussion and common working, the living experience of being the Church, may prove most valuable. 'The Son of Man is not come to be ministered unto but to minister' (Mk. 10, 45), and the Church too is a Servant Church, obedient to the Word of God and the guidance of the Spirit. When the Church listens to the witness of the Word in the consciences of all her members we may hope for a re-discovery of her role as Servant of the nations (Is. 49, 6), a rebirth in the Spirit.

1. AAS 1953 p. 798. On Pius XII's Allocution *Ci Riesce* see J. Courtney Murray's 'We hold these truths' pp. 61-63, and Eric D'Arcy's 'Conscience and its right to freedom' pp. 241-248. Both Courtney Murray and D'Arcy find the Allocution more positive and satisfying than I can.
2. Leo XIII: '*Human Liberty*'. Translated in Husslein's '*Social Wellsprings*' p. 135.
3. Bultmann has a valuable, though too individualistic, discussion of 'Freedom from the Law' in his '*New Testament Theology*' pp. 340-343.
4. Quoted in the CATHOLIC HERALD (London) April 3, 1964. Cardinal Tisserant was urging Pope Pius to write an encyclical on the duty of Catholics to resist the unjust orders of authoritarian States.
5. Eric D'Arcy: op. cit. pp. 76-84.
6. Thomas Aquinas, In II Sent. d. 39, q. 3, a. 3. D'Arcy, op. cit. pp. 87-94.
7. S. Th. 1-11 ae. q. 19, a. 5, a. 6. D'Arcy, op. cit. pp. 105-112.
8. Friethoff, '*A complete Mariology*', pp. 51-53.
9. Altholz. '*The Liberal Catholic Movement in England*', pp. 106-111. '*On consulting the faithful in matters of doctrine*' has been republished by Chapman in 1961, with a long introduction by J. Coulson.
10. Friethoff, op. cit. pp. 143-144.
11. Karl Rahner's '*Free Speech in the Church*' begins from this passage from Pius XII. Rahner excludes the working of the Holy Spirit from his discussion because he thinks 'public opinion' 'must always be in certain respects a secular idea' p. 9. I do not agree with this, the working of the Spirit in the Church is ordinary, i.e. part of her structural life. Rahner's '*Freedom in the Church*' in '*Theological Investigations II*' shows an advance in his thought here.
12. There is a short summary of Bishop De Smedt's speech in Xavier Rhyne's '*Letters from Vatican City*' pp. 217-219.
13. Quoted in Philip's '*The role of the laity in the Church*' pp. 4-5.

Odds and Sods

TRADE UNION

FATHER WILLIAM DUBAY, a controversial Los Angeles priest, has been in the news again during the last few months. He has been campaigning for a labour union for priests. He hopes to found an 'American Federation of Priests.' One of the goals of the proposed union is 'a transfer policy which protects priests from arbitrary and oppressive transfers at the hands of chancery officials.'

Arguing in favour of a grievance machinery, Father DuBay contends that curates have too few rights in terms of Canon Law, especially when they feel they are being unjustly treated or victimised by their superiors, particularly their bishop. In short, the dice are loaded against priests in any dispute with their ecclesiastical superiors. This, according to Father DuBay, results in much injustice and scandal.

Father DuBay has already been silenced because of his public criticism of Cardinal McIntyre's alleged 'malfeasance of office' as well as his (Father DuBay's) preaching on race. The latest move has been the suspension of this young priest and placing him under a type of ecclesiastical house-arrest.

Father DuBay has frequently argued that a priest's hands are so often tied that his ministry is seriously impeded. To remedy this situation, he has suggested that a priests' trade union be formed. This suggestion seems to be the wrong medicine for the disease which Father DuBay hopes to cure.

Among other things, a union of priests would equate hierarchy and management in the public eye and possibly in actual fact, too. Frankly, the less our bishops appear as big businessmen the better for the Church and the cure of souls. Furthermore, antagonism between priests and bishops is highly undesirable and ought to be minimised wherever it exists. A priests' trade union would certainly serve to intensify and institutionalise this antagonism. It would also involve the multiplication of power blocs and the less power blocs there are in the Church the better. Therefore, the more remote the possibility of a labour union for priests, the better.

While the priesthood has certain professional

aspects, it is essentially a vocation of service to souls. It is difficult to reconcile the Catholic priesthood with the right to strike, a right which Father DuBay expressly envisages. The priest is not an employee of the Church; he is a dedicated and ordained servant of the people of God.

Even if the communications structures between priests and their superiors do need overhauling and re-examination in some places, I doubt if this can be achieved by a priestly trade union. In fact, it is likely that just the reverse will happen.

It is sad when an apparently gifted and literate (*The Human Church*: Doubleday: \$4.50: 1966) young priest is driven to devise such an obviously ill-conceived plan as a trade union for priests. One hopes it will make his superiors think and act—in the spirit of *aggiornamento*, i.e. the Gospel in the 20th Century.

ECUMENISM

SINCE THE PONTIFICATE of that incomparable papal caretaker, John XXIII, the idea of ecumenism has caught on in many Catholic circles. To view ecumenism soberly is assuredly NON-U in certain strata of the Catholic community. Many ecumenical enthusiasts do strike one as being incredibly sanguine.

Some months ago I read an attack on the British bishops by an American Catholic journalist, who felt that these bishops were far too slow about climbing on the ecumenical bandwagon. Pointing to numerous Continental bishops, the writer upbraided the British bishops for their lack of sympathy and tardiness.

Frankly, my sympathies are with the British bishops who, by and large, according to reports, have made great strides in ecumenism during the last few years. Ecumenism is not simply a matter of charity and the sorting out of theological difficulties on a high, academic level. Admirable as all this is, to be ultimately effective ecumenism must touch the grass roots of the various Christian Churches.

The British hierarchy undoubtedly realises this. They are the leaders of a minority Christian group whose historic memory is not, *prima facie*, inclined to make them ardent ecumenists overnight. In framing policy

and taking stands, bishops, very wisely, must think of the impact on their flocks. The sociological *milieux* of British Catholics and their Continental brethren are vastly different, and this is obviously reflected in their different approaches and differential degrees of enthusiasm.

Only starry-eyed zealots believe that all outstanding problems between, for example, Catholics and the Anglican Church are on the verge of solution because the Pope and the Archbishop of Canterbury prayed together and exchanged the kiss of peace. History and its tendrils are not wiped away by one edifying encounter, even on the highest level.

It is a great mistake to view the ecumenical movement in exclusively theological terms. Historical and cultural factors must be taken into account; a total, rather than a purely religious view is demanded. Who could honestly describe the differences, disputes and hostility so long existing between the Protestants of Northern Ireland and the Catholics of Eire, as purely religious or entirely theological? And there are many more similar examples. Very often the social and psychological estrangements with which ecumenism has to do battle are far removed from theology. One writer sums up the position very aptly: 'There are historical antagonisms which, though very often based on political and social rather than religious differences, have none the less found their way into our concepts of religious identity.'

Later this year South African Catholic and Anglican scholars (chiefly of ecclesiastical subjects) will meet to discuss various aspects of Christian unity. All men of goodwill will wish them every possible success.

Apropos the movement towards Christian unity, a leading South African Catholic spokesman has said *SOUTHERN CROSS*, May 18th): 'The laity, under the guidance of the clergy, share in the apostolate by their good example, their prayers, their sacrifices and social action.' Nothing intellectual is expected from the laity, it seems. The ecclesiastical winds of change apparently do not blow everywhere with the same force or effect.

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

IN MY MORE CYNICAL moments I tell myself that my best letters (to the Catholic Press especially) have been those which were never published. Possibly, they dealt with topics considered to be indiscreet or impolitic to air under present circumstances. However, the letters that appear in the *SOUTHERN CROSS* interest me considerably even when I disagree with many of the writers.

Judging by the type of letter published over the last

few years, there does appear to be a tendency for letter-writers to the *SOUTHERN CROSS* to concentrate on questions of liturgy or ecumenism to the exclusion of other weighty and pertinent matters. Clearly, liturgy and ecumenism are controversial issues in this day and age, and many people easily get worked up about them. However, these two topics come to the fore so frequently that one wonders if they are not convenient escape routes, or blinkers for many readers of our South African Catholic press. They are 'safe' subjects whichever way you look at it.

Sometimes one can have a most critical letter published in the *SOUTHERN CROSS* about some politico-moral issue and no one will answer, and no debate or healthy controversy will follow. But should one write about, let us say, dress and attire at Sunday Mass, one stirs up a veritable hornet's nest.

What is also significant is the way certain letter-writers in the *SOUTHERN CROSS* use the 'label' argument without defining their terms or employ a particular definition which is non-applicable in the context under discussion. This was made very clear some weeks ago in the spate of letters to the *SOUTHERN CROSS* about the word 'liberal' in its South African context. Only ignorance or dishonesty, or incredible prejudice can explain the twisting and distortion that marked much of the correspondence.

I am not, and have never been a member of the Liberal Party, but I felt that certain writers were being grossly unfair to that party in their letters. Reading their remarks one was left with the impression that much of their distortion of actual day-to-day Liberalism in South Africa was self-righteous and sprung, not from honest-to-God intellectual conviction, but from an 'I'm-doing-all-right, Jack' attitude. Here, vested interests scored at the expense of the truth.

BANNING

FROM TIME TO TIME certain individuals in South Africa are banned by the Minister of Justice. Some banned persons are more prominent people than others, and these naturally get a better press than those who are less well-known. Actually, in considering this strangely South African phenomenon of banning, it is advisable to regard particular personalities as irrelevant to the issue.

Each and every banned person is compelled to undergo a type of social metamorphosis. To a considerable extent, he is de-socialised and his status is definitely tarnished in our present political climate. He also suffers quite a striking role-dispossession which can, of course, have serious consequences for the

health and balance of his total personality. A banned man must, of necessity, develop phobias such as always having to make sure he is only in the company of one other person. On the face of it, this may seem a trivial detail, but hardly if it has to go on day after day for years. There are many other examples of the psychosocial isolation and alienation which banning brings in its train, besides the invasion of areas of friendship and intimacy.

Banning, as practised in our country, is a particularly inhuman political device. A jail sentence would possibly ensure a more companionable existence.

The Minister often tells us that in banning someone he is acting legally in terms of powers conferred on him by Parliament. This is absolutely correct; and the South African community, master legalists that we are, are quite satisfied that another step has been taken to-

wards the maintenance of law and order. Our legalism is a strange animal, a convenient rationalisation; we possibly dislike expressing our belief that any end is justified by any means. We worship law without questioning its nature. We regard it as the act of the supreme authority of the State backed up by force. The retort, 'it is the Law', is generally sufficient to win, end or avoid an argument.

Because an idea or value or policy is enshrined in a statute certainly makes it legal; it then becomes law. But this does not make it moral. All the legal niceties in the world can never change something evil into something good. In doing what the law allows one to do is no guarantee that one is acting morally. Law can never whitewash what is evil. Thus, banning, even if supported by fifty Acts of Parliament, is still a vicious, evil and cowardly political tool.

Bode Wegerif

For the Record

CAN YOU SEE NOW', I was asked within days of my return to South Africa last year after almost ten years overseas, 'that this is the only country in the world without a racial problem?'

I could not make out whether the question was put in jest or was meant seriously. For I had come from an area of human experience in England where a sane society is seen as creatively conflicted—a reflection as it were of man's own inner conflict between self-interest and an altruistic awareness of the inter-relationship of all mankind. And now, I was being told, in effect, that I had to adjust again to the old concepts of State, material-scientific Progress and the rightness of privilege, if I was to be a contented White in South Africa.

It is an adjustment I have not been able to make. For how can one adjust to a way of life which rejects the experience of history, upholds the right of the State to repress all of a country's people, white and non-white alike if necessary, and is satisfied with a facade of security and a semblance of racial harmony?

It was because of this maladjustment to accepted group norms that I participated with the Rev. Dale White in the sponsorship and distribution of 1200 records of an address by Dr. Martin Luther King to a

meeting of the Episcopal Society for Cultural and Racial Unity in the U.S.A. Here I found a most powerful and socially meaningful reaffirmation of the simple truths of Christianity and other faiths, truths about love and justice which we all know to be basic to life and yet which we all somehow tend to neglect in favour of security and comfort. Had I known, when Dale White and I heard the original tape at Bishop Crowther's home in Kimberley and came together to the idea of producing a record for church and community leaders in South Africa what the consequences would be, I think I would still have gone ahead with the project.

For although the original motive to initiate a sensible dialogue on the Christian content of the address has been obscured for the moment by ugly and escalating controversy, the controversy as such has brought home to me as nothing else could just how fragile the facade of security is in South Africa, and how essential it is for those who believe in *simple* truths to actively resist the awesome *angst* that is gnawing at the heart of this wonderful country.

'Isn't it strange how our values have become distorted', a friend commented on first hearing the record. 'Here I am feeling subversive just listening to a

simple, straight-forward Christian message, with no direct reference in it even to South Africa'.

And what it is, if not all-consuming *angst* that has caused certain sections of the Afrikaans press to forsake all principles of fair reporting so as to create a wicked picture of Dr. King as a communist agitator or fellow-traveller somehow involved in a fiendish conspiracy with Senator Robert Kennedy, Bishop Crowther and ourselves to destroy South Africa? What is it, if not unreasoning fear, that makes it possible for a small pebble of truth in the pool of South Africa to engender tidal waves of emotionalism that threaten to spill over even into the international press!

Here we have this great, wealthy country of 17-million people spending some R1-million a day on defence, security and propaganda rocked to its foundations, or so one would fear from the Afrikaans press, by the distribution of 'An Address to the Churches' costing R900.

And this has not been the only incident that has evoked escalating hysteria in the last month. Because it annually arranges for 80 or so children to receive a year's schooling in the U.S.A. on an exchange programme, the American Field Service has been presented as a major threat to the *volk* in front page and leading articles.

I am now, more than ever convinced, that such a fearful drive along the road to isolationism can only be checked through the fearless re-affirmation of 'simple' truths. When a nation has reached the point in its breakneck drive for self-assertion that every pebble, every shadow, every ripple of wind along the road assumes menacing proportions, it is living out a nightmare, and only the clarity of simple truths can bring it back to reality and consciousness of its true destiny.

On the evidence of so-called *volk* reaction to the Luther King record and the A.F.S. I am convinced that more and more Whites in this nation are becoming subjectively involved in what is imagined to be a fight to the finish against communists, liberals, humanists, or more simply, at least 80% of the national population.

It is imperative that those not yet caught up in this self-destructive mania, recognise the danger and take steps to resist it.

Lawrence van der Post caught the flavour of the particular South African fear in 'Dark Eye in Africa'. Erich Frömm has given it broader perspective in 'Fear of Freedom' an analysis of *angst* in Nazi Germany. Both writers point to the fact that it is fear which blunts the sensibilities, hardens the heart and causes

people to invent 'logical' or 'conspiratorial' reasons why simple truths have no place in national life.

Malcolm Muggeridge, in an essay entitled 'What I Believe' has put it rather well. 'I have seen pictures of huge, ungainly prehistoric monsters who developed such a weight of protective shell that they sunk under its burden and became extinct. Our civilisation likewise is sinking under the burden of our own defence'.

Only simple truths can lighten the burden; yet paradoxically it is self-protective, defensive fear that has caused man throughout the ages to make martyrs of simple men with simple messages. Is it not fear that caused the restriction of South Africa's own Chief Luthuli whom one remembers from before his muzzling as having believed simply in Christian love and the brotherhood of man? And soon, out of fear, South Africans may well have to accept the muzzling of the voice of another winner of the Noble Peace Prize, Dr. Martin Luther King because he too has a simple message: 'Love or Perish'.

Or do we have to be reminded of the simplicity of the words of Christ Himself to make the point: 'He who lives by the sword shall perish by the sword'. The simplest of all men, crucified in effect as a political prisoner and anarchist on a Cross to which we are all still bound, whether we like it or not.

And so we remain committed to overcome fear and dauntlessly pursuing simple truths into new avenues of practical, social activity. This was the inspiration I gained through listening with Dale White to the recorded address of Dr. Martin Luther King. To many it is old hat. To many more it has still to be made meaningful.

To those who fear that the path of simple truths may lead only to insecurity and dangers we would offer this statement by the great theologian Kierkegaard as encouragement: 'The enthusiasm of noble minds is aroused only by difficulties. Whatever the one generation may learn from the other, that which is genuinely human no generation learns from the foregoing. In this respect every generation begins primitively . . . nor does it get further, except in so far as the preceding generation shirked its task and deluded itself'. ●

ROSE MOSS, a South African now living in the United States, is a regular contributor to CHALLENGE.

FR. JEROME SMITH O.P. is on the staff of St. Peter's Seminary, Hamanskraal.

EDWARD HIGGINS is a lecturer in sociology at Natal University.

BODE WEGERIF is an administrative executive in a Johannesburg publishing company.

COLIN COLLINS, a prolific writer, is a regular contributor to CHALLENGE.

PETER WALSH, one-time lecturer in Economics at Pius XII University College, Basutoland, is now doing research for his doctorate at Oxford.

PUBLISHED BY THE EDITOR A. P. GOLLER, 703 CAROLDENE, SOPER ROAD, BEREA, JOHANNESBURG AND PRINTED BY SHERRY & SHERRY (PTY.) LTD.-75738

African Family Life

IT IS A COMMONPLACE to say that the family is the cornerstone of human society. Nevertheless, the truth of this statement is evident particularly when applied to African family life in this country. The break-up of family life among the African people in South Africa is perhaps the most explosive factor in our peculiar society. The implications of this topic are as extensive as the subject of what the white man is doing to the black man.

That the family unit is undergoing enormous sociological change in this country is true of all racial groups. It is, however, particularly true of the African group. Christianity has brought with it values that have opposed or modified many tribal customs and maxims. Western civilisation has done the same and indeed the two are inextricably interwoven. More significant however, urbanisation has radically affected the family patterns of the tribe. All this is producing, for better or for worse, a different form of African family life.

This transition can be described in various parallels. It is from primarily a polygamous society to a monogamous one. In the tribe, marriage was more between two clans than two individuals. Increasingly in the cities, African marriages are becoming private arrangements between individual men and women.

So also, in a more general way, the community was emphasized in the tribal way of life. Detailed patterns of relationship were set up by tribal custom such as those between individuals and their parents, grandparents, aunts, uncles and members of their clan. Nowadays, in the city, the individual has often to stand on his own.

In tribal family life, the authority of parents was paramount—in the city, children are relatively free even from an early age. Initiation schools saw to it that detailed instruction concerning sex, marriage and the tribe, were given to young people. In the city they receive little, if any such directives. In the tribe, isolated people such as widows and orphans are cared for. In the new arrangement, state aid is coming to be a substitute. Young, unmarried women in the tribe have little status. In the freedom of the cities, they

achieve independence. The tribal ramifications of lobola are rapidly giving way to either a cash arrangement or nothing at all.

These are some of the ways in which basic African family patterns are changing in the modern life of South Africa.

FARMS, RESERVES AND CITIES

As the pattern of African family life differs according to whether it be in town, a farm area or Bantustan, it is worth noting that approximately $\frac{1}{3}$ of Africans live on white farms, $\frac{1}{3}$ in the reserves (Bantustans) and $\frac{1}{3}$ in the cities. It is necessary to look at each in turn.

The Africans living on *farms* are those least affected by the drastic changes in the patterns of African family life. Many Africans on the farms belong to a stable, tribal community and urbanisation has had little effect. An exception to this is the seasonal worker and further exceptions, the increasing numbers of young people who move from the farms to the cities in search of work or education.

The African families in the *reserves* are far more disrupted. This is owing to the fact that the reserves are not economically viable for the number of people living in them. Most sociological works on the subject indicate that almost the entire male population is away from the reserves for most of their working lives (between 20 and 50 years of age). Naturally enough, this has far-reaching effects on family life in the reserves. The mothers spend most of their time working in the fields, children rarely see their fathers, while fathers, in their turn, try to find a substitute for family life in the cities.

It is the Africans who either live *in the cities* on a fairly permanent basis or who are there as migratory labourers, who constitute the group most affected by the disruptive factors. This will be dealt with later in this article. Suffice to say that the Africans in the cities are now being considered purely as 'temporary work units'. This official attitude is described in the following sentences:

'Two-thirds of the people of South Africa—the Republic's 12,000,000 African citizens—have no secure

right to live and work in the industrialised and developed parts of their own country.

Any security of residence or employment they may enjoy outside the Reserves is dependent on administrative discretion.

This, in the starkest and clearest possible terms, is the central fact about South Africa's legislation controlling the lives and movements of Africans.'

(The new law affecting the African worker in a white area has been extended and tightened up to prevent any possible loopholes. It amounts to the following; and these were the main criticisms of the most recent Act—the Bantu Labour Act, No. 67 of 1964.)

1. The migratory labour system would be perpetuated.
2. All urban Africans would be reduced to the status of aliens.
3. No African would have the right to be in a town or city any longer.
4. Minor officials could break up the family life of such workers.
5. Wives could be prevented from joining their husbands.
6. Africans born in an area or living there for most of their lives could be sent away to areas unknown to them.
7. Anyone declared 'idle' or 'undesirable' could be sent away even if born in the area.
8. Officials would be given wide and dictatorial powers over urban Africans.
9. The government would have powers to direct the economy of the country through the regulation of jobs, homes and the movement of all Africans outside the reserves.'

(The new Townsmen—Dr. O. D. Wollheim M.P.C.)

MIGRATORY LABOUR

An aggravating circumstance of life in the cities is the presence of hundreds of thousands of migratory labourers. There are no adequate statistics on how many of these labourers are in the cities at present. It has been estimated that anything up to 1,000,000 of the 2½ million working African men are migrants in some form or another. The consequences of this circumstance on family life are obvious. A quotation from D. Hobart Houghton's 'S.A. Economy' is relevant: 'It is not easy to determine how many migrant workers there are, because in spite of all the machinery of registration and control there are no official statistics of internal migration, and the periodic censuses merely give a person's location on the night of the census. According to estimates made by the Tomlinson Com-

mission, there were 503,000 males temporarily absent from the Bantu areas at the time of the 1951 census. They represented about 40% of the males between the ages of 15 and 65. But as the Commission rightly points out, practically every able-bodied African man in the reserves goes out to work in industrial areas. The total pool of migrant workers from the Bantu areas of the Republic is therefore in the neighbourhood of 1,140,000. In addition there were estimated to be some 420,000 migrant workers from adjacent countries working in the Republic in 1951, and assuming the same ratio between the numbers employed at any time and the pool from which they are drawn, they must represent a further 1,000,000 men. Thus John Mvalo is representative of some 2,140,000 of his fellow migrant workers. Over 2 million men spend their lives circulating, between industrial employment and their tribal subsistence economy.'

TYPES OF PROBLEM

Taking into account all that has been said concerning the general sociological change that African family life is undergoing, the problems involved can be divided into three sections.

There are those social ills that are present in all forms of city family life. Secondly, there are the social ills consequent upon racial segregation and thirdly, those that result from the labour laws and system of migratory labour.

A list of general social ills could be found in any sociological work—some of the most important are infidelity, prostitution, drunkenness, unemployment and the housing problem.

In general the breakdown of African family life has led to a lessening of tribal moral sanctions. Unfaithfulness that would not have been tolerated in the tribe is now commonplace. The same is true of illegitimacy, divorce and juvenile delinquency.

These social ills are augmented by the feeling of insecurity that the African city dwellers feel as a result of the segregation, regulations and employment laws. The African can only regard his 'home' in the city as temporary and unstable. He cannot own the land on which he lives. His family is broken up by influx control. His ambition is crushed by job reservation, the education possible for his children is limited. Thus he has no responsible control over his environment or destiny in society. These factors cannot but have enormous repercussions on the stability of family life.

For migrant labourers, family life is virtually non-existent. There are the 300,000 domestic servants who are unable to live with their families except at short

intervals. There are the $\frac{1}{2}$ million (approx) men on the mines, living in compounds where prostitution and homosexuality are commonplace. There are the many other Africans employed in industry with no permanent home in the cities. For most of them there are 'kept' women in town and wives in the country. The only possibility for living a family life in fairly stable circumstances occurs in the vast township adjoining the cities. Even here, it is usually necessary that husband and wife be wage-earners and the time spent together with the children as a family unit is pitifully limited.

From all these factors it becomes evident that stable African family life is non-existent in the cities. This fact is the most explosive in the society of South Africa. Without a stable family life, African society, particularly in the cities will become fluid, irresponsible and chaotic. The youth of the future will be easy prey for subversive forces.

CONSTRUCTIVE PROPOSALS

It is unfair to blame all the above evils on government legislation. South Africa is undergoing revolutionary changes in its social and economic life. Certainly however, legislation is augmenting the breakdown of African family life and other than direct attack on such unchristian legislation, the following suggestions might be constructive:

1. A study of the extent of migrant labour with particular reference to African family life. The system of migratory labour as it exists in S.A. is unique in the world. Although migratory labour does exist in some European countries, the numbers, treatment and circumstances of labourers is totally different. No adequate study has been made, and indeed, because of the fact that such study would reveal the increase in flow of Africans to the cities, such a study is not likely to be done by government agencies. To sponsor such a project is the responsibility of the churches. The Cape synod of the D.R.C. in a report on the subject said: 'The Church can then do nothing other than seriously urge the State that a thorough investigation be made into the system with the object of either changing the system so that its disadvantages are removed, or of devising a new system which retains the advantages of the old but not its disadvantages. To argue that the Migratory Labour System is a temporary measure is a case of wishful thinking which could have disastrous results for the Church in the Republic. A Church may not become untrue to her calling.'

2. The churches could become directly concerned in the building up of stable African family life. They should see to it that both ministers and lay people be more informed concerning the problem. Social workers and marriage guidance councillors are needed. Instruction courses to young people should be part of the church programme. This 'family mission' could be organised along the lines of the American Christian Family Movement.
3. A campaign of concern—white people should be continually instructed concerning their obligations towards the family life of their employees, housewives, towards their servants. All church people should be preached to on this subject. So often white people dismiss the family life of Africans, asserting that 'immorality is part of the African's make-up'. In order to make people more aware of the difficulties besetting stable family life among Africans, conferences at regional levels should be held.
4. Emphasis on the social doctrines in the churches: The church should make its members increasingly aware of the social aspects of Christ's teaching—or charity remains unpractised and is not charity. Love of man to be effective must include real concern for him in his social context. In South Africa this implies such practical measures as the payment of a just wage, provision of leisure time and facilities and, in the light of this article, conditions in which the family can live together. If this is not done in S.A. the results could be disastrous for all.



Paul Goller

A Democrat among the Republicans

WILL SENATOR ROBERT KENNEDY'S first (and probably last) visit to South Africa have more than momentary significance? The immediate impact of his whirlwind tour far surpassed the expectations of his hosts, the National Union of South African Students, and the worst fears of the white establishment who opposed his entry into South Africa. But does the South African government really have much to fear from Senator Kennedy's visit, once the undoubted boost to the morale of its liberal opponents has begun to subside?

The National Union of South African Students (Nusas) has in recent years become the target for fierce attacks by the Minister of Justice, Mr. John Vorster; he has repeatedly threatened them with reprisals for what he terms provocative action (by which he means only that they exist) and the severe restrictions placed on Mr. Ian Robertson, the national president, shortly before Mr. Kennedy's visit were intended not merely to silence him, but also to intimidate other student leaders and to throw the student community into confusion. The student reaction to the banning orders placed on their president was strong and unequivocal, so much so that their sustained protest forced the Minister to meet a deputation of student leaders. The Minister is not obliged to give reasons for banning orders under the Suppression of Communism Act, nor did he give the students any explanation. It has become clear, however, that the Government has severely underestimated the determination of the students to retain their independence: most liberal commentators have been surprised by the solidarity and coherence of student protest, and within the student world itself the drift away from Nusas among non-white students has been reversed.

Against this background the response among students to Senator Kennedy's warmth and vision is more easily understood. The timing of his visit could not have been more opportune: the revival of militant leadership and the coalescence of substantial mass support within the universities has been strengthened and stimulated by Senator Kennedy's idealism at a

time when all liberal bodies in the Republic face new onslaughts from the regime. Senator Kennedy's words found greatest response among students and young people generally and it is here that the effects of his tour will be most lasting. Uncowed by intimidation, students will continue to emerge from the liberal universities, committed to principles of democracy and aware to some degree of the measure of change which is inevitable in this country. Yet it would be totally wrong to deduce from this that student politics and student involvement in political life here is evolving in the pattern of more volatile countries where students have brought down regimes or forced concessions from their rulers. The intolerance and intransigence of students at the Afrikaans universities is more truly representative of the mood and purpose of the dominant white group in South Africa, at least for the foreseeable future.

One inevitable result of Senator Kennedy's visit is not merely that he will be unlikely to be admitted again but that other distinguished visitors will be refused visas to enter South Africa: the more someone embodies the values of Christian humanism the less likely is he to be given the opportunity to challenge the bases of established white supremacy. At one of Senator Kennedy's meetings he was asked how the dialogue he advocated was genuinely possible when one of the parties was not only participant but also judge and prison warden in his own cause. This is the crux of the matter and Senator Kennedy was no more able to resolve the dilemma than are those who struggle endlessly to find more genuine ways of bringing about peaceful, but radical, change in South Africa.

Perhaps the most refreshing aspect of Senator Kennedy's visit was its style: idealists who are professionals are very rare in South Africa: further, Liberals have been in the wilderness for so long that they do not have solid political achievement, like Senator Kennedy's as Attorney General, to buoy up flagging spirits after half a generation of deteriorating race relations and shrinking liberties.

Only implicitly did Senator Kennedy touch upon

what is probably the crux of the South African situation, that change will come about only when those who are most oppressed begin to recognise that not merely do they have rights, but that they have the duty to claim those rights. Benevolent paternalism can never restore the dignity of those who are oppressed: only total commitment open to sacrifice and suffering can do this. Surely this is the lesson that the Church in the United States is learning—an experience which could be shared with the Church in South Africa. Has any real consideration been given in the United

States as to how American Catholics might aid and strengthen the Church in South Africa?

What then of the long-term significance of Senator Kennedy's visit? His speeches and actions were a total repudiation of racial superiority and were so recognised by those who opposed his presence as much as by those who valued it. If greater frankness and understanding can follow from the clear statement of totally opposed viewpoints then Senator Kennedy did all he could do in four days. But two parties are necessary for dialogue.

Peter Walshe

The Church and the Layman

THE TITLE ITSELF offers an introductory but important point. It is a statement comparable to 'The Football Team and the Forwards' or 'The Oasis and its deeper Waters'. In other words the laity form a part of the whole, they are not a separate co-operating group. The title is not a statement comparable to 'The Football Team and the Spectators' or 'The Oasis and Surrounding Desert'. As Archbishop Mabathoane has recently reiterated, the laity are not only in the Church, but with those in the Sacred Ministry and those in Religious Orders, 'they are the Church'.¹

Negatively one can therefore define laymen as the Christian faithful apart from those in the Sacred Ministry and apart from those striving for holiness in the particular way of a Religious Order (Nuns and Brothers). Positively the Laity are those incorporated into the People of God by Baptism, carrying the Christian message to the world, but not part of the Hierarchy.

The laity being part of the 'People of God' it is essential to understand what is meant by this expression. The 'People of God' are a new people, an historical reality which Christ has established in its full stature, in the stature of the New Testament. The 'People of God' have been described as 'a royal race of priests, to serve God the Father', but the term race is used here in a new sense, a new 'race' above race, and above national groups, transcending the ages as well as human divisions of culture, class, nation and continents. As the Constitution of the Church puts it,

'There is no room in Christ and in the Church for inequality on the grounds of noble birth, nationality,

social status or sex; for 'no more Jew or Gentile, no more slave and freeman, no more male and female; you are all one person in Jesus Christ'.²

It has not therefore been God's plan to sanctify and save men individually with no regard to their mutual connection.³ Rather Christ came to establish a people, the 'People of God', serving God in the knowledge of truth and in lives of holiness, lives expressed in serving each other and in serving the wider community. This group, placed amongst the larger numbers of mankind, while sometimes called 'a consecrated nation', a 'chosen race', is not in the New Testament a natural unity like race, not a narrow unity like nation, but a Priesthood sharing in Christ's Priesthood, a unity in spirit of a universal people, truly messianic, with Christ as its head and source of its life and grace.

What then is the goal or purpose of the 'People of God'? It is the Kingdom of God with its beginnings here and now in human history, history able to approximate and even to conform to God's design. History having within it a People able by Christ's power and their own devotion to orientate society towards God's perfect design. The People of God, transformed from the Israelites to an invitation to all men, sometimes small in number but established by Christ, is the 'rising shoot of unity, hope and salvation for the whole human race'.⁴ It is the instrument for salvation, imperfect, struggling for perfection in an often hostile and unregenerated environment, but nevertheless the light, the salt of the world, bearing the fearful responsibilities that this implies.

Clearly therefore the People of God are an historical phenomenon a consecrated priesthood strengthened by the sacraments, co-operating in Christ's Priesthood and thus a supernatural group, but with responsibilities in the natural order.

PRIESTHOOD OF ALL BELIEVERS

So one can speak of the People of God as the Priesthood of all Believers, a Priesthood with three facets to it.⁵ The first has already been noticed, the function of making holy. The second is to participate with Christ in his prophetic or teaching function, to teach by word and by example so that the Christian message of love penetrates daily life, in the family, in social groups, the parish, trade unions, co-operatives, factories, the legislature and international bodies. To teach is to set out to permeate and illumine the social environment, and by the extension of Christ's teachings and their practical application to enhance the dignity of the human personality.

Participating in Christ's Priesthood by a life of grace and by the action of teaching reveals the third facet. This is not a struggle for earthly glory and power, not a struggle to dominate and rule by force, but the effort to liberate human personality from mediocrity and to establish the Kingship of Christ, a new order of widening harmony within the People of God and spreading to the wider society, to nations and the international scene. This harmony of Christ's rule is the prize which follows the effective influence of the People of God. It follows Christian effort and labour in human realities, a labour to spread Christ's love and compassion, a labour to raise up the unregenerated environment both local and international to a state of peace.

Thus the layman is involved in the Priesthood of All Believers. He participates in the Priesthood of Christ, striving to increase in holiness, participating in the

teaching function of Christ and hoping to exceed obvious human limitations to unity and love, and so to raise up his environment towards the level of a new order increasingly in conformity with Christian ideals.

If then we can speak of the Priesthood of All Believers and hence the Priesthood of the Laity, what is the relationship between the laity and the Priesthood of the Ministry? The difference is not one merely of degree. The ministerial priesthood has peculiar responsibilities. It is responsible for the maintenance of the Church as a group, and for the government of that Church as a group, i.e. for the government of the priestly people around their central acts of worship. This should be done in mutual trust and full co-operation with the laity. In addition the Priest makes Eucharistic Sacrifice in the name of all the people. The faithful, by virtue of their own priesthood, *concur* in this sacrifice, praying with the priest, receiving the sacraments and directing their lives in a Christian way.⁶ Consequently there are distinguishing features in the Ministerial Priesthood as it functions in parish, bishopric and in co-operation with the Bishop of Rome. These are (a) a responsibility to teach and keep the faithful together as a group, (b) to administer the sacraments, and in these ways to increase the holiness and effectiveness of the People of God in their own lives, in their actions towards each other and towards the wider society.

Now the way is prepared to see more clearly the peculiarity of the Priesthood of the Laity. Its larger role is amongst the wider community, in renewing the temporal order in justice and love, that is in the social, political and economic environment which if falsely ordered can make truly Christian life almost impossible.⁷ The Laity must seek to bring the rights and duties of the People of God into harmony with rights and duties in secular society. They must recognise,



for example, the functions of the state, but always seek a more perfect order, avoiding secular excesses such as the denial of religion, the crushing of human personality, the encouragement of unqualified narrow loyalties to race, nation or class. In short the laity must seek the kingdom of God in the transaction of worldly affairs and in the re-arrangement of the secular order. According to the Constitution of the Church, 'The chief position in the wholesale fulfilment of this duty is held by the laity. Their competence in the secular sphere and their activity, have been raised intrinsically by grace to a higher level. By these means they must make vigorous efforts to see that the resources of human labour, technology, civilization are deployed in accordance with the Creator's plan and the light shed by his word. In this case all men without exception will benefit from the cultivation of the goods of creation, these things be more suitably distributed, and will make their own contribution to universal progress in human and Christian freedom. In this way Christ will use the members of the Church, to increase the shining of his saving light over the whole of human society'.⁸

So, while recognising the special responsibilities of the Ministry it can be seen that the Christian apostolate is not conducted by reference to the hierarchy. As Bishop McGrath of Panama put it, there is no reason for Christian civilisation to be ecclesiastical, all of us simply as men, even apart from Baptism, have the task of organising the world.⁹ The Christian however must take up secular values, supplement and better them, doing this by example, teaching and secular competence. In a very real sense, and flowing from this necessary involvement in the secular world, there is a responsible freedom, an independent action for the laity. They are not mere delegates of the clergy but bear responsibilities flowing from the Priesthood of the People of God. Theirs is not simply to 'believe, pray, obey and pay', but to function in their own spheres of particular responsibility always seeking that mutual trust, charity and co-operation which should characterise relationship between laity and hierarchy.

SPECIFIC FIELDS OF ACTION

What then are some particular fields of lay action aiming at a more Christian order in society and undertaken whilst in dialogue with the hierarchy? First it is clear that active involvement must go with the fullest possible co-operation with our separated brethren,

'with those who are baptised and have the honour of the name of Christian, yet do not profess the faith

in its entirety, or maintain union in fellowship under Peter's successor. There are a great number who honour sacred Scripture as the norm of belief and life, and who show sincere religious zeal. They have a loving faith in God the Father Almighty and in Christ his Son, our Saviour. They are marked by baptism and hereby joined to Christ; acknowledge other sacraments too and receive them in their own churches or ecclesiastical communities'.¹⁰

But this co-operation is to go even further, to all men of goodwill:

'Those who recognise the Creator, and among them especially the Moslems; it is their avowal that they hold the faith of Abraham, they join us in adoring the single, merciful God who will judge all mankind at the last day'.¹¹ Finally it is to encompass those in ignorance of the Christian gospel but searching in sincerity of heart — 'they do so under the influence of divine grace' and can attain everlasting salvation.¹² It is therefore clear that the laity dare not be defensive, withdrawn. We are called by our priesthood to involvement in secular realities and to permeate the world.

Particular fields of social involvement will spread outwards from that basic unity in society, the family, to the region of parish and diocese, and in turn involve works of charity and mercy at local, national and international levels. But any such action while occurring in a particular context, cannot be in passive acceptance of that social environment. A city slum, rural stagnation, harsh extremes of wealth within nations and between nations, these are situations where human beings rot through lack of love and vision, love and vision which the laity should provide. Christians must realise they have a commitment comparable to the Marxist, and it is perhaps a reflection on us that there are not too many communist gatherings exhorting their devotees to a reverse comparison! There must therefore be a vision of a restructured society, a vision stimulated by conscience and awake to the importance of the economic order in conditioning a society, an economic environment which to repeat an earlier phrase, if falsely ordered can make truly Christian life almost impossible. The Christian must therefore be on his guard not only against religious repression, but against economic institutions which can increase animosity and hatreds, and against economic poverty which can be almost totally crippling to human personality and is a terrible evil when the technical means to its alleviation are available.

There are at least two important reminders for the Christian from within the Marxist's approach—

Marxism recognises supra-national ideals and there is an element of truth in the claim that economic environment conditions people and must itself be deliberately moulded. These lessons can be learnt from other sources too, for the whole evolution of modern science, with its fantastic blessings, and the pleas and encouragement of the Social Encyclicals ('*Rerum Novarum*' published a generation before the Russian Revolution) invites us to set out to mould our environment, rooted in theology not in dialectical materialism.

SOCIALLY RADICAL

The Christian laity must therefore be socially radical in the following sense. As a dedicated group they must strive for a universal vision, breaking out of the confines of narrow exclusive loyalties, building upon the Word of God 'an education of love (to produce) a Church capable of renewing the world around her. Love, as the root of humility, a spirit of poverty, religion, sacrifice, fearless truth and the pursuit of justice.'¹³ Such a mentality would be able to take up and heal tensions and divisions within families, villages, towns, nations and within international disorder, striving to establish 'from a family of all peoples and races, one city.'¹⁴ In addition to a vision and practice of love, unrestrained by inherited prejudice, the laity must be socially radical in their determination to re-order society as they have been invited to do in *Rerum Novarum*, *Quadragesimo Anno*, *Mater et Magister* and *Pacem in Terris*, rejecting fundamental principles of both the Communist and Capitalist orders, rejecting the class struggle and its hatreds, rejecting the unrestrained competition which was supposedly to bring unbridled human greed into conformity with the common good.

The laity must therefore search for a detailed application of the principle of subsidiarity, which respects and encourages the smaller groups in society, in so far as they can adequately fulfil the tasks they set out to accomplish. There is no detailed plan ready and available for every particular society, but there can be no blind acceptance of the traditions of either Capitalism or Communism. The role of government and the possibility of nationalised industries must be accepted, trade unions encouraged, worker ownership and profit sharing considered, the co-operatives supported. There must in a bold attempt to create productive units, harmonious economic institutions, serving the common good but functioning in themselves as centres of human fulfilment, mutual trust and justice. An example of this is the effort required to improve consultation between workers and management and a willingness to go further and to integrate all participating groups within top policy making committees.

ECONOMIC REFORM

Both the developed and underdeveloped areas of the world require a constant and critical discussion of their economic and social orders. On the particular issue of world poverty the more developed countries need a deliberate cultivation of that morality which has come to accept the necessity for a redistribution of wealth and for certain national welfare services. But the cultivation of this morality must now go a step further and accept the application of these principles at an international level, beyond the confines of particular nations. In the more underdeveloped areas there should be a deliberate encouragement of social discipline, the willingness to tax for development and the willingness to conserve scarce talents and resources for the establishment of new economic structures. As already mentioned there is no set institutional pattern to which the new economic order must conform, but clearly it will not be a mere aping of Communist experience or that of particular economies that have evolved in the Capitalist tradition.

In conclusion a brief summary. The Church and the Layman involves the Priesthood of the Laity in close co-operation, mutual respect and dialogue with the hierarchy. Both laity and hierarchy have however their own areas of special responsibility and initiatives. The laity carry a particular responsibility to influence and modify the wider social order, accepting the radical nature of this mission (a) As a universal people with supra-national ideals, using smaller groups for their right purpose, not trapped exclusively in loyalties to village, city, nation or race. (b) Deliberately seeking social justice in the restructuring of the social and economic order. For if we cannot show the human and Christian meaning of progress, if we do not make it clear that man's labour contributes to justice and love amongst men, and is somehow a distant preparation for the Kingdom of God; if we are incapable of proposing a theology of these earthly realities, or if the laity is incapable of acting effectively; if our faith unenlivened by love, does not show itself in deed and truth through social effects, then we shall lose the coming generation to an anguished materialism,¹⁵ and the world may well be left with its rich and poor, its hatreds, unqualified nationalisms, racialism and increasing despair.

Alternatively an effective laity, seeking and achieving the widest possible co-operation amongst Christians and others of goodwill for 'the world is too strong for a divided Christianity'.¹⁶ An effective laity can bring love and increasing harmony into the tormented struggle of the world towards greater unity in this second half of the 20th Century. ●

8 - FEB 1967



challenge

An Independent Review

EDITED BY CATHOLIC LAYMEN

Volume Three DEC 1966 – JAN 1967 Number Five



JOHN DUGARD
The Court and South West Africa

COLIN COLLINS
American Catholicism – Some Impressions

S. J. ENGERING
Die Brug Replies

EDWARD HIGGINS
On Reflection

DALE WHITE
Authority and Identity

FINBARR SYNNOTT
The Church and Wealth

BODE WEGERIF
Poem – Lazarus

SISTER PIENTIA
Illustration – Angel of Peace



CHALLENGE
P.O. BOX 5015, JOHANNESBURG 15 cents
SUBSCRIPTION: R1 p.a. (post free)

Ut omnes unum sint

Editorial

ON CHRISTMAS EVE, 10 laymen stood, with posters, outside the Catholic Cathedral of Christ the King before and after the midnight mass presided over by the Bishop of Johannesburg. We were obliged, in conscience, to make this stand in apparent defiance of our bishop's refusal to allow the posters, sponsored by the Christian Council, to be displayed in Catholic churches because 'this would be meddling in politics.' The posters drew attention to the separation of African families and placed the responsibility for this upon the laws of the country.

Reactions, in public statements and in private comment, to this significant new development in church life have been, in the main, so ill-considered that it may be worthwhile to analyse the issues involved and the assumptions which underlie these reactions.

THE AUTHORITY OF CONSCIENCE

To many the issue is clearcut. The bishop is shepherd and guardian of his flock and, therefore, his decisions must not be challenged, still less defied. Such an argument stated baldly, as it usually is, reduces the conscience of the individual to a cipher and implies a concept of obedience which destroys personality. It has to be balanced by the claims of conscience. The Second Vatican Council teaches that 'in all his activity a man is bound to follow his conscience' and continues, 'in the formation of consciences the Christian faithful ought carefully to attend to the sacred and certain doctrine of the Church.'

I believe that we have attempted, seriously and systematically, over a period of years, to form our consciences and, therefore, we are under some obligation to follow the dictates of conscience. If, however, consciences are not rightly formed to make judgements in matters such as this, this is primarily because those whose duty it is to teach have not taught consistently or clearly, or, in some cases, at all.

AN OPEN CHURCH

How then are consciences to be formed so that Christians become fully responsible members of church and society? The connection between church and society here is a real one because until Catholics, for

example, are encouraged to be, and do in fact become, full responsible members of the Church, they are unlikely to be full, adult members of society with a clear understanding of, and respect for, the rights and duties of all men. Or must we rely on secular reform movements to awaken a sense of social justice in Christians?

The full extent of the role of the laity is a newly re-discovered insight in the modern Church, one which can be neither ignored nor assumed to be self-evident. It must be worked out in an open Church where exchange of opinion and experience is not artificially restrained or rendered useless by the suppression of relevant facts, fears or dilemmas as is common practice at the present time. There must be much more consultation among Bishops, clergy and laity, if individual Catholics are not to be forced to take, alone, moral decisions which are more properly the product of communal searching and evaluation.

Occasionally, the prophetic role of the layman may include the necessity to recall the attention of the hierarchical church to some fundamental crisis facing it. One can only hope that this will never occur, for the prospect, once perceived, is a daunting one. There are, however, already 'foreign', Catholic priests in this country who have been instructed by their superiors not to preach upon the moral aspects of race and politics. Against such a background it is not surprising that the action of a small group of Catholics in standing with posters at the door of the Cathedral should develop unwarranted overtones of defiance.

WORSHIP AND POLITICS

The relation between liturgy, the public worship of the people of God, and the life of Christians in civil society is a further issue which is raised by this incident. It is eminently desirable, and perhaps even obligatory, when the people of God assemble to worship together that they should there confess those sins which are common to the whole community, those sins which require common action if restitution is to be made. Sins, such as our responsibility for the separation of families in South Africa, are thus very properly to be repented at the great festival of the family which is one aspect of Christmas.

Further, as the Vatican Council teaches, 'the liturgy is the summit towards which the activity of the Church is directed; at the same time it is the fount from which all her power flows.' For the layman this means that all his concerns, his fears for the future of his country, his involvement in the fight for social justice, cannot,

and should not, be sloughed off at the door of the Church. They are part of what he consciously offers at mass, what he wishes to have resolved or strengthened for himself, what he wishes to become a genuine concern among his fellow-worshippers. The relation between worship and secular life is a reciprocal one and it is crucial for the church in South Africa that worship lose any pietist tinge it may have and achieve its full social dimension, in all sense of the word social. The poor are, indeed, our allies.

CO-OPERATION AMONG CHRISTIANS

The initiative for a poster display and special prayers at Christmas came from the Christian Council. These Christians have cause to be perplexed at the attitude of the Church in this diocese towards ecumenical action and Catholics who work in the ecumenical field have equal reason to be confused, when requests for co-operation such as this are refused. No one can be expected to ignore his own judgement of the suitability of particular forms of action, but we Catholics can, legitimately, be expected to give more serious consideration than we appear to do to the considered judgement of other Christian leaders. The Vatican Council has pointed to specific areas of concern for common action, viz: 'a just appreciation of the dignity of the human person, the promotion of the blessings of peace, the application of Gospel principles to social life.' To ask other Christians to wait until we Catholics think time and place is unexceptionable may well be to ask too much.

MANDATE TO TEACH

Underlying all these issues, however, is the question of the exercise of the full teaching mandate of the Church. Almost all our Churches are under direct pressure from the state to conform, to preach on those parts of the Gospel which are acceptable to secular power. Here the Church is denied faculties for her mission, there restrictions are placed upon manpower to fulfil her task: here she is told, subtly, what the attitude of the true Christian should be, there she is told, bluntly, not to interfere except, perhaps, to bless the troops before they go to war. The Catholic church, more than most, has hostages in the hands of the state: her schools and institutions, her large number of foreign-born missionaries. But can the Church suppress the truth, can it play down the Gospel and still hope to survive?

The tactical measures have failed (what price another round of dialogue about the future of Mariann-

hill?). The people are becoming demoralised in all but the most individualistic sense of the word (move among the people and see how racial superiority and prejudice have driven deep into the souls of many Catholics). The lessons are there to be learnt. What the Christmas poster stand demonstrates is that there are now some lay Catholics who are prepared to take more seriously the pastoral letters of our Bishops. Everyone else in the Catholic Church will now have to take them more seriously also.

NOT A MIDDLE-CLASS CHURCH

The Church cannot become a middle-class institution, accepting middle-class priorities, using only middle-class methods. The Church is the Church of the poor, the servant of the people, and her riches are not those of privilege, of status, of exploitation. The church 'encompasses with love all those afflicted by human infirmity and recognises in those who are poor and who suffer, the image of its poor and suffering founder.'

To make this assertion real it is the duty of each individual Christian and the first step in South Africa is to admit our responsibility for the poverty and suffering of our fellow citizens. ●

Lazarus

Lazarus

Now that you are back from the grave
I do not think that you should give the sermons
Said the priest

You wear your death too closely
And your usual sultry look
Is greyer with this experience
I think you should take yourself a wife
And later we can see again

There was nothing Lazarus could say
He was inarticulate to express
The pain in his chest
Was Christ in agony

He was above and beyond and beneath
His range
Weeping silently
Bitterly and afraid.

BODE WEGERIF

John Dugard

The Court and South West Africa

ANYONE WHO BELIEVED that the July judgment of the International Court of Justice on the dispute over South West Africa would afford relief to the South African government on the international front must have been sadly disillusioned by the recent proposals in the General Assembly of the United Nations to wrest the administration of the territory from South Africa and place it under direct international control. The truth, however unpalatable it may be in South Africa, is that the ruling of the Court solved nothing. Instead, the Court's indecision has generated a new spirit of urgency amongst the nations of the world to reach a political solution for South West Africa acceptable to the international community. In South Africa this new move is received with bewilderment as the S.A.B.C.'s Current Affairs program had optimistically suggested a new deal for South Africa in international affairs as a result of the Court's decision. These sanguine expectations were built on faulty foundations and were the result of reading too much into the Court's judgment. It is the purpose of the present study to place the 1966 decision of the World Court in proper perspective in the twenty year old dispute over that vast tract of land that is South West Africa.

The dispute over South West Africa has its roots in the peace settlement of World War I. Instead of permitting the victorious powers to annex the former German colonies and Turkish possessions, it was resolved to place them under international protection. Hence the mandates system was devised whereby these territories were entrusted to guardian States, termed mandatories, which were to administer them on behalf of the League of Nations as a "sacred trust of civilization". One of these territories was South West Africa and, in 1920, the Union of South Africa was appointed as Mandatory for the territory, subject to certain conditions contained in an agreement known as the Mandate for South West Africa. Although South Africa was given the right to administer South West Africa as an integral part of the Union, her powers fell far short of those of a colonial master, for the Mandate provided that she was obliged to "promote to the utmost the

material and moral well-being and the social progress of the inhabitants of the territory"; to refrain from establishing military bases in the territory; and to ensure freedom, of worship, which included permitting "all missionaries, nationals of any State, members of the League of Nations, to enter into, travel, and reside in the territory for the purpose of prosecuting their calling". The Mandate laid down two procedures for enforcing these obligations. Firstly, South Africa was to report annually to the satisfaction of the League on her administration of South West Africa. Secondly, jurisdiction was conferred on the International Court to hear "any dispute whatever . . . between the Mandatory and another member of the League of Nations relating to the interpretation of the application of the provisions of the Mandate". It is this latter provision, contained in Article 7 of the Mandate, which has been the focal point of the most recent proceedings.

POSTWAR MOVES

During the life of the League South Africa reported annually on the administration of her "ward". But in 1946 the League of Nations was dissolved and replaced by the United Nations. This event led South Africa to request permission from the General Assembly of the United Nations to incorporate South West Africa into the Union. In refusing this request, the General Assembly recommended instead that the territory be placed under the trusteeship system of the United Nations which had been created to replace the Mandates system. All the other States to which mandated territories had been entrusted by the League voluntarily placed such territories under the new trusteeship system. But South Africa refused to do this and the struggle for South West Africa began. Although the post-war United Party government continued to send reports on its administration of South West Africa to the United Nations while admitting no legal obligation to do so, the National Party government, after its advent to power in 1948, refused to submit such reports. Repeated pleas by the General Assembly for South Africa to place her "ward" under trusteeship or, at least, to

report to the United Nations on her administration, fell upon deaf ears and in 1950 the General Assembly asked the International Court of Justice to give an Advisory Opinion on the legal obligations of South Africa in respect of South West Africa. The Court held that South Africa was not obliged to place the territory under trusteeship, but that the Mandate of 1920 continued and South Africa was obliged to submit reports on her administration of South West Africa to the United Nations as the successor of the League. Furthermore, the Court stated that South Africa had no power to alter the status of South West Africa without the consent of the United Nations.

The 1950 Opinion of the International Court was advisory only. South Africa was not obliged to carry out its ruling and she has not done so. But the powers of the Court are not merely advisory for, if it gives judgment in a dispute brought before it by States, and not by the General Assembly, its decision is binding and may be enforced by the Security Council of the United Nations. Pursuant to South Africa's refusal to accept the 1950 Opinion of the Court, Ethiopia and Liberia, the only African ex-members of the League apart from South Africa, applied to the International Court in 1960 for an order that the Mandate was still in force; that South Africa was obliged to submit to United Nations supervision in respect of South West Africa; and that South Africa had violated the terms of the Mandate by practising apartheid in the territory, which was incompatible with her obligation to "promote to the utmost" the welfare of the local inhabitants. Ethiopia and Liberia (hereafter referred to as the applicants) contended that the Court had jurisdiction to hear the dispute by reason of Article 7 of the Mandate which gave the International Court the power to hear "any dispute whatever" between South Africa and another member of the League in a matter relating to the interpretation or application of the Mandate. South Africa, however, objected to the standing of the applicants before the Court and to the right of the Court to hear the dispute. Consequently, in accordance with the practice of the Court, the hearing of the merits of the case was suspended until the preliminary issues, relating to the competence of the Court to hear the dispute, were determined.

1962 RULING

The enquiry into the preliminary objections was heard by the Court in 1962. One of the objections raised by South Africa at this stage was that there was no "dispute" between her and the applicants, as re-

quired by Article 7. In support of this objection, it was contended that a legally recognized interest was a prerequisite of a 'dispute' and that the applicants had no such legal interest in the welfare of the inhabitants of South West Africa. The purpose of article 7, it was argued, was to permit member States of the League to invoke the Court's protection where their own *material* interests or those of their nationals were involved. Thus the applicants might have been able to bring an action to protect the rights of any missionaries in South West Africa who happened to be their nationals, because such rights were guaranteed in the Mandate, but they could not bring an action to protect the rights of the indigenous inhabitants. Such protection was to be afforded by the League of Nations itself and not by the Court. The International Court, in finding that the applicants had the required standing and that it had jurisdiction to hear the merits of the dispute, rejected the above argument. It stated that

"The manifest scope and purport of the provisions of [Article 7] indicate that the Members of the League were understood to have a legal right or interest in the observance by the Mandatory (i.e. South Africa), of its obligations . . . toward the inhabitants of the Mandated Territory".

In 1962 the International Court rejected South Africa's preliminary objections by eight votes to seven. Among the dissenting judges on that occasion were Judges Spender of Australia and Fitzmaurice of Britain. Both they and other dissenting judges upheld the South African contention that the applicants lacked the necessary material interest in the subject-matter of the dispute.

1965 CASE

When the Court assembled in 1965 to hear the merits of the dispute over South West Africa it consisted of fifteen permanent judges and two temporary or *ad hoc* judges chosen to represent the parties to the dispute. It was reduced in size, however, by the recusal of Judge Khan of Pakistan, the illness of Judge Bustamante of Peru and the death of Judge Badawi of Egypt. Both the latter judges had voted against South Africa in 1962 while Judge Khan, who had not been a member of the Court in 1962, was known to be bitterly opposed to apartheid.

During the course of the public sessions which lasted from March to November, 1965, South Africa called fourteen witnesses to testify to the merits of separate development. The applicants called no witnesses. In fact they conceded the correctness of the evidence

adduced by South Africa but contended that the policy and practice of apartheid violated an alleged standard of international law of non-discrimination and were therefore incompatible with the Mandate's requirement to "promote to the utmost" the well-being of the inhabitants of South West Africa. In adopting this policy the applicants dropped their original charge that apartheid was "oppressive". Not too much importance should be attached to this switch in tactics—despite suggestions to the contrary by Current Affairs—as, according to the South African judge *ad hoc*, Mr. Justice van Wyk, in his 1966 separate opinion, it was apparently only made "in an attempt to limit the factual enquiry" which would have been necessary if the applicants had contested the correctness of the South African evidence on conditions in South West Africa.

On 18th July of this year the Court gave its judgment and by the most slender margin possible—by the casting vote of the President, Judge Spender—found against Ethiopia and Liberia on the ground that they had no legal right or interest in the welfare of the inhabitants of South West Africa. The seven judges who, together with the President's casting vote, constituted the majority were Judges Spender (Australia), Winiarski (Poland), Spiropoulos (Greece), Fitzmaurice (United Kingdom), Morelli (Italy), Gros (France) and *ad hoc* Judge van Wyk. The seven dissenting judges were Judges Koo (China), Koretsky (Soviet Union), Tanaka (Japan), Jessup (United States), Nervo (Mexico), Forster (Senegal) and *ad hoc* Judge Mbanefo.

REVERSAL OF DECISION

The judgment of the Court in 1966 in fact reversed its own previous decision of 1962 and assumed a marked resemblance to the joint dissenting opinion of Judges Spender and Fitzmaurice of 1962. It is difficult to avoid the conclusion that all that happened was that because of recusal, illness and death the minority of 1962 was transformed into the majority of 1966, which then simply reiterated its previously expressed views.

The Court held that, although it had heard evidence and argument on the merits and demerits of apartheid as applied in South West Africa, there was one preliminary question which had to be answered before it could pronounce on such matters, namely the question whether the applicants had "a legal right or interest" in the subject-matter of their claim. If the applicants had no such right or interest, the Court could not pronounce on the merits of the dispute at all.

The Mandate for South West Africa, declared the Court, protected two kinds of rights: firstly, the rights

of the indigenous inhabitants and, secondly, the rights of nationals of member States of the League i.e. those missionaries of League member States who might be "prosecuting their calling" within the territory. These rights, according to the mandates system, were to be enforced in different ways. The rights of the indigenous inhabitants, notably their right to have their welfare promoted "to the utmost", were to be safeguarded by the League of Nations *as a body* and not by its individual member States. Such rights were to be enforced by negotiation and discussion within the organs of the League, so member States, by participating in such debates, could raise objections to the administration of South West Africa. But that was the *only* way in which they could.

The rights of nationals of League Member States in the mandated territory, on the other hand, were to be enforced by individual States by means of the International Court. This, said the Court, was the *raison d'être* of Article 7: to protect those nationals of League Member States who might be engaged in missionary work in the territory, and not to protect the local inhabitants. Because the applicants did not seek to protect their own nationals but the indigenous inhabitants, they had no legal interest in the subject-matter of their claim. They would not have had this right in the days of the League, nor did they have it in 1966. The Court rejected the suggestion that when the League was dissolved its rights devolved upon its individual member States. As the applicants had no legal interest in the subject-matter of their claim, the Court found that it was impossible for it to pronounce on any of the real issues before it.

CHARGES OF INEFFICIENCY

It may be that the Court was right in deciding that the applicants lacked the necessary legal interest in their claim. But this point was a preliminary one which fell to be decided in 1962. Indeed, even the Court of 1966, while insisting that the matter related to the merits of the dispute, conceded that it was of an "antecedent character". And, of course, there is the inescapable fact that the Court *did* decide the matter as a preliminary issue in 1962 in favour of the applicants. The Court of 1966 dismissed the 1962 finding as "provisional", but there is no indication in the 1962 judgment that the Court then regarded it as such. It is therefore extremely difficult to reject the views of the American judge, Judge Jessup, and of the Soviet Union judge, Judge Koretsky, in their dissenting opinions, to the effect that the whole matter of the applicants' interest was finally decided in 1962 and that the Court

had no right to reopen the matter. This is why charges of "inefficiency" have been levelled against the Court by certain African States: not because the decision went against them in 1966, but because it reversed a matter which had been decided in their favour in 1962.

Although the majority of the Court made no finding on the real issues before it, these were examined by Judge van Wyk in a separate concurring Opinion and by all the dissenting judges in their separate Opinions. Judge van Wyk dismissed all the applicants' claims and added that the application of a policy of non-differentiation on racial lines in South West Africa would prove "disastrous". On the other hand, all the dissenting judges held that the Mandate was still in force, most that the United Nations had succeeded to the supervisory powers of the League of Nations over South West Africa and five that apartheid was incompatible with South Africa's obligation contained in the Mandate to "promote to the utmost" the well-being of the peoples of South West Africa. None of these separate opinions is binding, however, and their value depends entirely on the reputation of the author and the cogency of the reasoning.

NATURE OF INTERNATIONAL LAW

A question which has puzzled many is why the Court divided evenly on so crucial a matter. Of course no conclusive answer can be given, but the most probable explanation is that the judges' disagreement stems from a basic difference as to the purpose and nature of international law. Amongst international lawyers there are, broadly speaking, two schools of thought. One school adheres to the traditional, conservative view that international law is a law *between* States alone and that the sovereignty of States should be limited as little as possible by international law. The other school believes that international law is concerned not only with sovereign States, but that its ultimate object is the protection of the individual. As totalitarianism has increased within States, so international law has developed and must develop still further, to curb the powers of the State over its own citizens. The growth of international law to encompass the welfare of the individual is illustrated by the creation of the International Labour Organisation to afford protection to workers; by the establishment of the Mandates and trusteeship systems to promote the welfare of ex-colonial peoples by means of international supervision; and by the insertion of the human rights provisions in the United Nations Charter to indicate the conduct expected of member States within their own territories.

The majority of the Court in 1966 appear to belong

to the traditional school. This explains why it interpreted the provisions of Article 7 of the Mandate, which gives the Court jurisdiction over "any dispute whatever" arising out of the Mandate, in a highly restrictive manner so as to embrace only disputes over missionaries and not over the treatment of the indigenous inhabitants. The minority, on the other hand, adopted a more dynamic approach and indicated that the maximum effectiveness should be given to the Mandate's provisions and spirit by permitting States to invoke the jurisdiction of the Court to question the administration of a mandatory State. Clearly the minority was motivated by humanitarian considerations, but the majority expressly declared that such considerations could not be taken into account unless they appeared in "legal form". The majority also indicated that it was aware of the fact that the restrictive interpretation it gave to "any dispute whatever" would reduce the effectiveness of the Mandate as, with the League of Nations no longer in existence and the Court unable to enquire into breaches of the Mandate relating to the treatment of the peoples of South West Africa, there might be no body capable of requiring due performance of the obligations enshrined in the Mandate. In this respect the Court appears to be out of line with its own past practice which has been to interpret treaty provisions so as to give the maximum possible effect to the purpose of the treaty.

CONCLUSIONS

Whatever the legal merits or demerits of the Court's 1966 judgment one fact is crystal clear. The Court did not decide any of the real issues before it. Consequently it is necessary to turn to the Court's previous pronouncements for guidance on the legal status of South West Africa. In 1962 the Court was concerned with its jurisdiction to hear the dispute and therefore made no binding decisions on the merits of the case. Significantly, however, it went out of its way to express approval for the findings of the 1950 Advisory Opinion. The conclusion is, therefore, inescapable that the legal position of South West Africa is governed by the decision of the Court in 1950 to the effect that the international Mandate is still in force; that South Africa is obliged to submit to United Nations supervision in respect of her administration of the territory; and that South Africa has no competence to alter the status of South West Africa without the consent of the United Nations. While it is true that this Opinion is not binding upon South Africa and that there is no legal machinery for its enforcement, it must still be seen as a correct statement of the law by the World's highest Court.

Although unavoidable, the above conclusion is not a popular one in South Africa. This was evidenced by the annoyance with which the United States's reminder that the 1950 Opinion still stood was received. It is upon the 1950 Opinion of the Court that the present efforts within the United Nations to deprive South Africa of the Mandate are based. The international community, while no doubt disappointed that the Court did not provide it with an enforceable judgment against

South Africa, has its losses and recalled the 1950 Opinion, in terms of which the United Nations does have the *legal right* to concern itself with the administration of South West Africa. It is naive to view the issue as one domestic to South Africa. The good government of South West Africa is a matter of international concern: the United Nations is bound, both legally and morally, to ensure that the "sacred trust of civilization" is enforced in the territory. ●

Colin Collins

American Catholicism – Some Impressions

The size and structure of the American Church and its complexity are the obvious things to comment upon. The United States is now a country which in population has attained the 200,000,000 mark. Broadly speaking, one-third of these people are members of the Catholic Church. The Catholic Church is highly complex in organization in the United States, having more than 250 bishops, 60,000 priests and a multitude of religious organizations, lay groups, welfare societies as also a vast educational system. The Catholic Church in the United States is probably as a single church, the strongest religious influence in that country.

Perhaps the strongest impression concerning the Catholic Church in the United States—and this especially in certain areas such as the East Coast—is the dichotomy between the more structural elements and the groups sometimes called the "New Left" in the Church. It is perhaps a little unfair to describe this dichotomy in the following terms especially as the great mass of Catholics fall somewhere in between structure and the New Left. It is also unfair to make this generalization because obviously some of the structural elements are involved in progressive thinking. Nevertheless the contrast is striking and it may be roughly described as follows:—

On the one hand the structure of the Church in the United States is not only visible; it is impressively visible. The strength of the bishops and the various organizations associated with them is well known. Associated with the structural elements of the Church is the usual type of parochial life. In large areas of the United States a good percentage of the population is Catholic. Frequently parishes are wealthy, well-administered and

popular. The majority of priests are of course occupied with parochial life. In general therefore the visible element of the Church represents wealth; it is administrative-minded and in the main part of a conservative frame of mind. The impression gained was that with few exceptions the majority of bishops, priests and even the laity belonged to this category.

In parenthesis it may be mentioned that the rather authoritative control exercised in the Church in the United States seemed to present an amazing contrast with American society as such. In the main Americans and particularly the younger set are freedom-loving. Indeed they seem to take this sometimes to the point of wanting scarcely any discipline whatsoever. American society wants things explained to it by public authority. It wants reasons for why it is being directed or ruled in this or that fashion. Yet within the Catholic Church there is found an almost unthinking acquiescence to various aspects of authority that seems almost foreign to the American mentality. This may be an exaggerated impression, but quite frankly it did come as something of a shock.

At the other extreme are the rather small groups of Catholics who represent the New Left within the Church. Quite a large number of the laity, especially the younger ones, are associated with this element. A number of priests, particularly in the mid-West as also a very small number of bishops, are associated with or form part of this sector of opinion.

Politically speaking this group seems to be far closer to the climate of American society. It is open in so far as new ideas are constantly being thrown around and also in so far as ecumenism comes naturally to it. This

element in the Church is also experiment-minded. It is engaging largely in experiments in the liturgy. Not only are some rather interesting experiences being sought in the line of folk-song masses, but also in rather more radical experimentation. This element in the Church is also critical. It is often critical of authority—sometimes too much so. Many of the laws in the Church are being openly questioned and opinion on such matters as birth control is certainly that it should be allowed.

To what extent does this New Left within the Church exist in the United States? This is difficult to say. Some people speak of an "underground Church". This is perhaps an unfortunate expression. Certainly, however, there are probably very few dioceses in the United States that do not have fairly strong representatives of this New Left within the Church. These groups are particularly strong where the conservative element is more powerful. In fact this element is becoming so outspoken that there is talk of an authority back-lash in the United States within the Church. This will contrast somewhat with a certain permissiveness of the American bishops that has existed until now.

What is particularly unfortunate about this situation is that there seems to be very little communication between these two groups. It is also important to know that this duality does not exist in quite a number of places. Even to have described this condition in such a clear-cut way is to have exaggerated it.

SIGNS OF GROWTH

There are four developments (and probably a lot more) in the Church in the United States that seems to be of great consequence. They are as follows:—

Firstly, the existence of groups of people—particularly lay people—who are doing a lot of serious thinking. These groups exist at all sorts of levels. There are, for example, the many lay people who are taking theology at universities and the teaching of theology as a full-time profession. And then, again, many of the groups associated with or in the universities are also doing important work. In the field of journalism, these people are represented in a more popular style by the "National Catholic Reporter", and in a thoughtful manner by "Commonweal". Even more traditionally run magazines such as "America" and "Ave Maria" act as sounding boards to such opinion. There are tens of thousands of Americans who read these magazines and who are vitally interested in the "updating" of the Church.

Secondly, in liturgical matters a lot of experimentation is taking place particularly among the younger people. In the university groups, for example, the so-

called "guitar" or "folk-song" mass is fairly universally accepted. Every effort is made in a lot of these groups to make the liturgy a genuine communal expression. Unfortunately this type of experimentation was rarely found at parochial level.

Of particular significance in this regard is that this style of liturgy is bringing back the emotional touch into the religious feeling within the Church. This is probably going to be a very important element in the future Church of the United States.

There are also very definite attempts being made to adapt the liturgy to the modern world. Masses, processions and prayers are constructed for particular events of modern society. This type of useful experience is sometimes embarked upon with the permission of authority and sometimes with authority turning a blind eye to it.

Thirdly, the social awareness of some elements in the Church is also of great significance. (This was particularly seen in the mid-West and more particularly in the Chicago area). Some examples of this social awareness are the specialized groups such as the Young Christian Workers and the Christian Family Movement. Other examples are the increasing participation of Catholics in the Civil Rights Movement. Of particular interest was a group of 600 Religious Sisters in Chicago who are engaged in urban development schemes in their spare time. A last example of social awareness is the fact that there are many auxiliary lay groups modelled to a certain extent on the Peace Corps who are giving their time to improving social conditions in countries outside the United States. All these examples are evidence of a New Look in the Church in America.

INVOLVEMENT OF PRIESTS

Fourthly, the interest of many priests in "up-dating" the Church is perhaps one of the most encouraging signs. In some dioceses these priests are isolated and are considered to be "way-out". In one diocese in particular, however, i.e. Chicago, the majority of the priests have formed an Association. The primary aim of this Association is that priests should be considered as an adult professional group in the modern world. Resolutions were passed at their first meeting concerning appointments, specialized work and pensions. The formation of such an association is almost certain to produce a crisis of authority vs. personality and will no doubt result ultimately in a new concept of obedience within the Church. In this particular Priests' Association the most crucial problems of the Church are being tackled within the very structure itself. This development is perhaps the most important of all in

the Catholic Church of America.

The four last points are hopeful ones. There will, nevertheless, be periods of conflict within the Church. There is, however, much to hope for especially if authority remains open, flexible and aware of what is going on. Many adaptations will have to be made particularly at local community level. It is argued by some for example, that parochial structures in the large cities and Masses attended by 3-4000 people have little religious significance. For this reason some are suggesting that married people be ordained to act as priests for the smaller community of the single street or block of apartments. Whatever this and many other suggestions may mean, they will certainly all have to be considered. So often the impression gained not only in America but in the whole Catholic world is that Catholic thinking is always trying to catch up rather than to initiate.

In making these few generalized points about the Catholic Church in America, the Catholic Church in

South Africa has been kept very much in mind. There is in South Africa a danger of the same duality as that described. To obviate this duality several suggestions come to mind. There should, for example, be a greater experimentation in matters liturgical, particularly in small groups. There should also be greater co-operation between authority and the people at all levels: Sometimes bishops, priests and people scarcely communicate. There should be greater freedom of expression within the Church. So often laity—even informed laity—who give their opinions are labelled as agitators and are kindly asked to refrain from “rocking the boat”. Finally, a greater number of informed priests and laity are needed.

The above suggestions are made not to imply that these things are not already being done. Certainly, however, much more must be done both in America and in South Africa. These days it is true to say that what was planned yesterday, and done to-day, is already old by the time it is done. ●

S. J. Engering

Die Brug Replies

I ADMIT THAT THE article which particularly offended Mr. Higgins and many more readers (it was on the achievements of the Republic) could be interpreted as one-sided, but it is not as one-sided as Mr. Higgin's attack on Die Brug for “slanted theology and deification of the monster of nationalism”.

After some years of trying to get on its political feet, Die Brug has adopted a policy of “welwillendheid” (goodwill) towards the present Government. This is not because we are bending over backwards to please the Nationalists or the Calvinists, but because we are aware of the extremely complex racial set-up which admits of no easy solution.

“We feel that a sustained mud-slinging campaign and negative criticism would achieve exactly nothing.” Separate development certainly falls short of the lofty ideals preached on the Mount. Die Brug sees it, however, as a transitory stage in the growing pains of a young nation. It is not evil in itself but is fraught with pitfalls, injustices, cruelties (often not intended), to all of which Die Brug had continuously drawn the attention of its readers.

Mr. Higgins accuses all those in sympathy with Die

Brug (at a guess, about one half of White Catholics in South Africa) of contravening “the Supreme law of the Gospel”.

These are great words indeed! They smack of a papal pronouncement. But infallible pronouncements come few and far between these days—which is all to the good.

We do not wish to indulge in practical politics. We can only advise our readers—irrespective of the political party to which they belong—to effect in themselves and in others a change of heart.

This would bring about respect for the dignity of the human person and his inalienable rights. He must not be regarded as a “thing” or a commodity but as a creature of God.

In this manner race relations will become imbued with the Christian spirit. In the long run this change of heart may lead to a situation where racial integration will appear less dangerous (for the Whites) and less unacceptable than we can at present foresee.

This attitude may appear to some as not very heroic or idealistic. It does not make “martyrs for the cause”. But it does aim at something more positive than

negative condemnations.

Die Brug was started in 1952, the year of the Van Riebeeck Tercentenary. As Catholics we felt we had something to contribute towards the building up of the South African nation, of language, literature, education, etc.

We must remember that Calvinism, after all, is an offshoot of Catholicism, and Afrikaans is unique in being the only European language which has developed outside a Catholic culture.

When in later years the need for closer co-operation between churches came to be felt, Die Brug acquired the subtitle of "bridge between Catholics and Protestants" and began to pay more attention to ecumenism.

Let me explain what ecumenism means, since Mr. Higgins seems to be at sea as regards the basic principles of this movement.

Edward Higgins

On Reflection

JOB MOTIVATION

IN THE PAST IT USED to be said by some that South Africa's greatest asset was its cheap labour. Admittedly, the gap between the wages of skilled and unskilled workers always was, and still is, considerable. But this does not mean that our labour is cheap. On the contrary, many experts have come to view our poorly-paid non-white labour force as expensive and wasteful—anything but cheap. The underprivileged worker is often poor and his necessary labour frequently appears as a liability rather than an asset.

It would be a great mistake to view this phenomenon strictly from the economic angle. In actual fact, the social and cultural factors at work are paramount. In South Africa, the employer class is predominantly white middle- and sometimes upper-class. These types are the pace-setters and goal-definers in industry, commerce, agriculture and government. In their occupational roles, these people maintain certain accepted standard of punctuality, responsibility and ambition; their work attitudes are largely sensible and rational. This, of course, is all part of their cultural conditioning; the employer class sees these attitudes functioning in their own milieu. This work-attitude pattern is not necessarily innate or inherited; it is behaviour that is learned in the

Ecumenism is not bending over backwards to please the Protestants, as Mr. Higgins seems to think. It is not being nice to the poor Protestants who do not know better. It is not converting the heretics to the "one true fold".

It is not watering down Roman dogmas which would effect a false unity. The "slanted theology" of which Mr. Higgins complains is nothing else but the "ecumenical" theology now at last gaining ground in South Africa.

If he knows nothing about ecumenical theology and if he still lives theologically in the post-Tridentine period when the Church had all the pat answers to all the questions the heretics could possibly raise, it is certainly not the fault of Die Brug, which has always had an open attitude in the theological and pastoral sphere. ●

process of growing up and gaining experience. It is primarily a cultural phenomenon rather than a purely individual characteristic.

Our employer-type is very often disgusted and annoyed by the work approach of his non-white employees. Especially on the lower levels, the employer encounters shiftlessness, irresponsibility, lack of ambition, absenteeism and high job turnover. Many middle- and upper-class persons automatically attribute this behaviour to "bad" genes when it actually springs from cultural conditions. Much of the puzzlingly and seemingly stupid behaviour of the underprivileged worker is simply a normal response learned in a poor physical and social environment. The type of behaviour deplored by the employer is quite rational and normal from the worker's point of view and in terms of his socio-cultural environment. For example, his home is overcrowded and often hellish and he spends as much time away from it as possible and what little money he has, he wastes on gambling, drink, dagga and sex. This is the normal response dictated by his environment. It is hardly calculated to make him an efficient and highly productive worker.

Whether the underprivileged worker is black or white, the response-pattern is strikingly similar in those

parts of the world from which data is available. The paramount concern of those who live from hand-to-mouth is physical security; they are forced to concentrate on absolute necessities such as food and shelter on a purely subsistence level. Such people have very little, if any, room for ambition; high achievement goals would be quite unrealistic for them. Getting ahead is a luxury the underprivileged worker cannot even afford to dream about. Because of the sort of life he has always lived, one finds that long-term goals are notoriously absent from the thinking of the underprivileged worker whether he be black or white, in South Africa or elsewhere.

Deprivation, malnutrition, social and psychological disorganization—this is all part of a common background vis-à-vis the underprivileged worker. What do such things do to him? How can such persons be expected to be efficient? What sort of work motivation can one reasonably expect from the underprivileged worker? How does one go about making this type seek after higher goals? Vital as these questions are, they admit of no glib solutions or oversimplified answers.

In times of stress and crisis, the average underprivileged worker can fall back on family and friends for help and support. He can do this quite successfully to a far greater degree than either the middle- or upper-class person. The lower-class worker has, as is well known, quite different notions of responsibility and loss of face than members of other classes.

The life-situations encountered daily by the underprivileged worker are demoralizing. In addition, the little education these people receive is so often unreal. When they were schoolchildren teachers held out middle-class rewards to them but these rewards are out of reach as far as the underprivileged children are concerned.

Particularly in the case of the underprivileged worker, it is pointless to try to reform the individual without making corresponding changes in his environment. Certain items clearly demand immediate attention, viz., decent homes, job stability and a chance to improve one's status. As in all other spheres of human endeavour, in the occupational world the game must be made worth the candle. ●

BISHOPS AND TEACHING

SINCE VATICAN II THE Catholic bishops of the world can never be quite the same again. But this is easier said than done. In many parts of the Catholic world, the bishops are being hammered from many sides. Constructive criticism—even of bishops—is a good thing but some of the critical assaults on the bishops

underline the fact that critics believe the bishops are magicians. Bishops are expected to rule their dioceses, guide their flock and administer temporalities but it is unrealistic to expect them to work miracles.

In introducing necessary changes whether of administration or doctrinal emphasis, bishops have to bear in mind both the mentality and ability of clergy and laity. This has always been difficult but it is probably all the more trying for the postconciliar bishops. In the case of a Catholic bishop, the hand of ecclesiastical tradition is heavy and for the many changes demanded by Vatican II there are scarcely any precedents. One cannot blame the bishops for having to feel their way gingerly in certain spheres. I must confess that I often feel sorry for the bishops when I think of the vast amount of homework Vatican II has given them.

One presumes that our bishops are still busy studying the Council documents but let us pray that the net results of that will not be a mere proliferation of elite study clubs without any action. The Council clearly wants the faithful to live more creative lives and here the bishops must do the inaugurating work.

NEGLECT

Looking back over my life as an adult Catholic in South Africa, one episcopal role seems to have been—and still is—disproportionately neglected, viz., the teaching office of the bishop. Governing the dioceses, managing the finances, administering the sacraments, opening bazaars, laying foundation stones and making pretty speeches at religious jubilees—we have had plenty of this. But what of teaching? In the past, the purely physical aspects of establishing and building the Church in missionary South Africa quite naturally overshadowed the teaching demands of the episcopal office. However, today in a world of high-pressure mass media of communication, it is imperative for the teaching office of the bishop to receive top priority.

Cliches whether religious or secular are not conducive to good teaching. A good teacher tries to put across old truths and new insights with vigour, clarity and originality. He does not talk in set formulas; he makes his words relevant to the condition of his hearers. As one journalist observes: "If people are always fed mashed potatoes instead of meat in the name of religion, they're going to lose either their appetite for religion or their capacity for biting down hard on an idea."

Not everyone is a born teacher but the bishop is a man singled out from among his fellows and consecrated for high office. He is a successor of the Apostles and in his "bishopness" he is equal to the Pope. *Inter alia*, he is charged with feeding his flock

even if they find some of the truths he teaches embarrassing or too near the bone for comfort. Let us be quite honest: the teaching office of the bishop is a difficult one to carry out successfully in contemporary South Africa. The would-be teaching bishop is shackled by many considerations which it would be foolish to ignore. A bishop's pronouncement carries far more weight than that of priest or laymen and consequently what might be prudent in a layman might very likely be imprudent in a bishop.

Nevertheless in many of the speeches at Vatican II one noted a new openness, frankness and relevance, a new concern for purely human problems which have moral implications. One wishes that this general concern could be embodied in the still largely disused teaching office of the South African bishops. The latter seem too inclined to take the view that the joint pastorals absolve them from teaching in their own dioceses. I personally find this an untenable view. The message of the joint pastorals can so easily be brushed aside by clergy and laity alike whereas the teaching of the bishop on the spot is harder to ignore.

The type of teaching here envisaged is the kind which strives to make the Gospel relevant to, and operative in, the market place of everyday life. In this context I can readily sympathise with those of our bishops who may feel that the less teaching they do the better in view of the complexity of the South African situation. However, their reaction makes me think of the approach of Father Alfred Delp, a German Jesuit, executed in a Nazi concentration camp shortly before the end of the war. In his last letter from prison he justified the value of an apparently pointless and impossible struggle and protest against evil with this pregnant observation: "This is the time of sowing, not the time of harvest." ●

THE BATTLE OF THE GAP

IT IS COMMON KNOWLEDGE that a great economic gap exists between the white and non-white groups in South Africa. But there is an even more serious gap between income and expenditure in the non-white population groups themselves and no Christian can be indifferent to this grave phenomenon. The joint problem of poverty and low wages has been investigated by many commissions and private bodies since the Native Economic Commission of 1932. All these surveys and investigations have shown that the wage of the average non-white worker fell below the minimum cost of maintaining himself and his family. The experts talk about the poverty datum line but this is not realistic because it is such a bare minimum with no provision made for such necessary items as education, health and clothing.

But there are many who have to live below this minimum subsistence level. According to the 1960 census the modal average annual income for whites was R2000-R2999, for Coloureds less than R200 and Asiatics R200-R399. Figures are not available for the Bantu but all economic surveys up to now have shown the Bantu to have the lowest average income of all four ethnic groups.

Since wages and the cost-of-living have risen hand-in-hand in the past few decades, the battle of the gap is unabated. There are certain standard means of reducing the gap e.g., debt, reduced expenditures or increased income. Debt, in the long run, especially for non-whites is difficult and hazardous. Reduced expenditure can mean skimping on food with serious consequences especially for children. Increased income is usually achieved by illegal means or by making sure both parents work.

For a committed Christian, charity in the shape of donations to the St. Vincent de Paul Society, Kupugani, the Community Chest, etc., as well as passing on laudable as they are, can never be a substitute for, let us say, a living wage. Better wages enable people to help themselves more effectively.

In paying an employee a living wage one is not doing him a favour or a kindness because justice is involved—a worker is entitled to a living wage by the very fact that he is a human being. Justice—the giving to every man his due—is far more fundamental than almsgiving. Justice demands a wage level which makes acts of charity, in a sense, unnecessary.

History teaches us how extremely difficult it is for the voteless masses to achieve economic redress. In our South African context, this places an even greater moral burden on the shoulders of the white electorate. After all, an aristocracy must take on the responsibilities of aristocrats—*noblesse oblige*.

Social evils cannot be removed on the cheap. If wages are increased, prices rise, the consumer pays more, we have inflation. Consequently, some thinkers argue that economic reform demands a systematic, non-disruptive redistribution of wealth; it must be gradual and evolutionary rather than cataclysmic and revolutionary. The means suggested include slight dividend reduction, increased rates and justly differential taxation. Profits, rather than the purchasing public, ought to meet the costs of justice in this matter of a living wage.

TERROR OF COMMUNISM

Many Christians are terrified by the bogey of a Communist-inspired revolution but how few would support any enduring practical steps—such as a greater measure

of social and economic justice—to avoid such an upheaval? The underdeveloped countries, especially Africa, prove that political democracy without a measure of economic democracy is insufficient. In fact, a modest wage increase among our lower socio-economic groups would do more for our country's future than putting a thousand agitators in jail or merely banning them without trial.

In so many ways, our white achievement here in Southern Africa has been a splendid one. We whites live well and in reasonable comfort. In some respects our society appears to be opulent rather than affluent while many of our countrymen lack the necessities of life. We whites have turned pastoralists and nomads into an industrial proletariat. From this, in some ways, they have obviously profited greatly but this change has nevertheless contained disastrous consequences for them as well.

In shaping South African society we whites have always called the tune; we have had the upper hand, therefore, our obligations are all the graver. Some have been aware of these obligations but so often we have been paternalistic when we should have been just. We have been sentimental when we should have been radical. In spite of goodwill and sincere motives, our charity frequently demeans and humiliates when justice would build up and reinforce a common humanity. I honestly think that it is difficult to deny that the gap between the haves and the have-nots in our country is just a trifle too great for either comfort or complacency. ●

Dale White

Authority and Identity

GROWING TO MATURITY in a culture at one extreme supple and lax, at the other rigid and depersonalised, is the tension of South Africa today. The social and personal forces which operate produce a particular ambivalence towards authority and complicate the problem of personal identity.

An example of this was to be seen recently among a group of teenagers who completely disregarded the prescribed norms of parental authority regarding boy-girl relationship, yet when challenged regarding the norms of racial mixing reverted absolutely to parental pro-

nouncements.

For everyone the alignment of cultural and social life along the unalterable impact of skin colour sets an implacable authority at the heart of accepting oneself or others.

Persons with a white skin find themselves accepted and pampered at the upper end of society. Is this superiority really a part of his personal being and will he ever be able to discover whether he is accepted in his right as a person—or merely as a unit of the race he represents? Similarly the desire of the African to be recognised as a person and not a monochrome blob encounters the same criterion of having the wrong colour. The problem of who am I, and when am I an *it* and when a *thou*, produces a deep ambivalence towards the decisive authority of skin colour.

The growing pressure of apartheid in society tends to favour the I-it relationship. Social contact, which might reveal the person, intellectual interaction, which might destroy the facade; residential separation, which restricts encounter; separate facilities, projecting the image of superiority; all leave in splendid isolation the master-servant relationship.—The most difficult sphere in which to discover the *I-Thou* of relationship.

The public sector has become more rigid and control is more widely imposed; the private sector is more circumscribed and ingrown. This escalating rigidity becomes determinative of a whole scale of personal attitudes towards an authority against which it is taboo to rebel.

Yet even within the master-servant relationship certain capabilities, reliabilities and personal impressions break the rigidity of an I-it relationship and persons begin to emerge. The typical stylised attitudes of authoritative familiarity often crumble and set up a conflict between social norms and personal values. However, when this conflict leads to rebellion against social norms the result is often crushing defeat of the individual and his slow reverting to acquiescence. He substitutes the "privatism" of I know an African and am kind to him for the dynamic potential for social reform which this encounter offered.

Acquiescence towards authority is the touchstone of our social continuity and stability. But like any abberation where no dynamic counterpoint can be established this situation produces either severe self estrangement—between what you believe and what you can practice—or more frequently a silent withdrawal. Acquiescence to authority rather than rebellion removes the possibility of sounding out the boundaries of self. Authority often produces in people a creative opportunity for rebellion against that which is not themselves

and thereby reveals more of their personal identity. Thus, if clearly defined absolutes of right and wrong exist then it is possible to experiment with one's relationship towards them and test capacities and develop alternatives, but because of the pervasive non-critical approach to the authority of society this often becomes silent withdrawal. To meet this vacuum of identity a social prescription of the individual is often provided. This is usually done in the strait-jacketed conformity of the educational system where each group is prepared for its station in life. Indoctrination need not be deliberately practised, but carefully groomed conformity is certainly its Siamese twin. As a result of pre-existent categories, ideas and social placing, incentive and initiative are stifled and acquiescence re-enforced. A great deal of African tsotsism and white rowdyism, the resurgent violence and search for "kicks" finds a seed bed in this unrebellion.

Despite the taboo on rebellion against the monolith of colour some do rebel. They begin to experience an acute alienation from society, a drastic repudiation of their meaningful past and a strong reaction sets in. This reaction may be neutralised by a relapse into the privatism of family and personal gain, accumulation of material goods, and cynical unconcern for the rest of society. Alternatively this reaction can produce such critical estrangement from society that the projected violent destruction of all it stands for is contemplated with equanimity.

Ambivalence towards authority usually produces contradictory extremes of behaviour, a strong dependence on the source and standard of authority coupled with sudden resentment and rebellion. This fluctuation which produces inconsistencies in behaviour often provokes a crisis of identity. Who am I? and which am I?

Finbarr Synnott

The Church and Wealth

WE LIVE IN A TIME when the world is split into two camps on the question of the use of wealth—with a possible third developing in modified forms of European Socialism and, in Africa, under the influence of such thinkers as Senghor. Communism, the chief social phenomenon of the century is a religion of the redistribution of wealth. Apart from an elaborate economic

leads to a desire to resolve the ambivalence. Out of this experience can come a new perspective and understanding of self so that from ambivalence it is possible to grow into independence.

In this independence it is possible to have a new perspective on the authority of colour and its significance for my identity. A possible consequence of having identified self is a real and more complete acceptance of self and others and a passing into a deeper experience of the I-thou relationship.

There are two ways by which acceptance of self may be accomplished when confronting the barrier of colour. The first is finding self within the system, identification and acceptance of oneself within the social pattern. This identification provides sufficient commitment and finds its fulfillment in undertaking action to further the whole social process. The second result may be to accept oneself in dynamic tension towards the social delineation of colour. A sufficient level of acceptance of self and others may provide enough commitment for short term action based on a different yet nonetheless social concept of South African society.

It is doubtful whether the complete identification of the first response will produce a fully mature I-thou relationship. Such a person may lose his self identity and revert once more to ambivalence, towards the demands of authority. The second response may be more tentative, but because it breaks with the delineation of colour, it provides an opportunity for creative experiment in acceptance and communication with people from all groups. A different pattern of relatedness no longer dependent on colour begins to emerge and strengthens the possibility of further I-thou relationships. •

theory in some of its leadership, this is what holds it following. They are atheists, if they are atheists, because communist; not communist because atheist.

From being a question internal to countries, between rich and poor men, this question has now spread to one between countries. The few rich countries of the world control three-quarters of its wealth, while three-quar-

ters of the world has not enough to sustain life properly. It happens that the rich countries are those called Christian.

In South Africa we have the two problems combined: rich, very rich; and poor, starvation-level poor. We have two separated nations, a rich one and a poor one. Between them, in spite of their economic inseparability, there is perhaps more distance in mind than between America and India. Again the rich happen to be those who chiefly claim Christianity, and have offered it to the others.

Yet God is love, and Christ was poor.

Where does the Church stand about all this—what says the Gospel?

We must remember here that the Church represents no one social or economic system. Its mission is primarily eschatological, that of salvation, and to declare what the Christ-like life demands under any system. However committed it must be to present reality, and the proof of love by sharing, we must expect no total social or economic plan from it, only direction as to how the person and community must use their abilities and their wealth in order to fulfil the final purpose of their life.

For this reason we must welcome a new approach visible in the Council documents, not in terms of law and system, but in terms of a spirit of voluntary poverty, evangelical poverty, offered as an ideal to the Church and all its members, lay and clerical.

“The life of Christians, both social and individual, will be permeated with the spirit of the beatitudes, notably with the spirit of poverty.” (Decree on the Modern World. 72.)

We can see in this a great principle of Christian approach through the spirit rather than through system and legislation. There are always experts, made timid by knowledge, to tell us that any fundamental redistribution of wealth would wreck national economies and the balance of world economy. What is needed beyond the experts and their systems is a love which gives the will to share, rebalancing all systems, establishing the priority of the human over the technical. This means in the better-off persons or nations a will to voluntary poverty and sharing.

I want to open this discussion over a wide field, of the whole history of the Church. So if some statements seem to excessively brief, I trust the reader will remember that I am only suggesting general tendencies, not trying to finalise anything.

The word “share” is used above deliberately. It is the characteristic of the modern social movement that it rejects the idea of “charity”. What a man needs must

be given in justice. The poor are tired of being underpaid and then given assistance in a form of patronage. They want their rights. This is good as far as it goes. It belongs to a man's self-respect to resent as alms what his work should have earned. The Church has entered fully into this justice campaign. But unfortunately the immense attempts at social systematization of justice in last hundred years show us how they can often lead to a greater tyranny over the poor themselves. So, alongside the justice plans, a voluntary campaign must always go on, both to humanise the plans, to see that the machinery, mental or physical, does not destroy man, and to make up for its deficiencies by voluntary action. This must however not be done in the way of patronage, but somehow in a spirit of sharing and brotherhood which is convinced—convinced, that is, that the one who helps with the lesser value of material wealth may gain as much or more in higher values from the other with whom he so links his life. When St. Louis the King kissed the foot of a begger, he really saw the latter as a sacramental, mediating grace. We can perhaps say, in our mental framework, that the man who shares poverty with a friend will become more wholly human.

If we look into the pre-history of the Church in Israel for ideas of attitudes to wealth, we find something which drew interesting comment from both Augustine and Aquinas. The ideas concerned with wealth are presented to us in the Old Law in the context of divine sanction of the customs of a people settling from nomadism into agricultural life. (These laws are singularly like those of the African tribes, which were coming up to the same point when met by the white man). It requires a mental jump to enter into understanding of such lore. For it is not in terms of our categories such as individualism and collectivism, justice and charity. It is terms of an implicit concept of group solidarity between human persons, in which each exchange is from the one who has, in proportion to his having, to the one who has not, in proportion to his need. This, rather than any exact or even proportional equalization, is its spirit.

St. Thomas, commenting on the social precepts of the Old Law, says they were intended (i.e. adopted and sanctioned as from God) to accustom people to share their goods with others as a practical proof of love, which was the intention of all the Law. His word “share”, (*communicare*), which could also be translated “communicate” and so be seen in its Eucharistic reference, is important. It contains a reciprocal idea, not quite the same as “give”.

St. Augustine has the observation, of doubtful his-

torical value but still illuminating, that because they were trained in such spirit, the Jewish converts could adopt community of property with the Apostles, but St. Paul's pagan converts—from the manorial and capitalistic Roman society, could not.

EXAMPLE OF CHRIST

When we come to the Gospel we must remember that it is revelation in a Person, Christ. This is for all, not only some. Christ positively sought poverty in the circumstances of his birth, early life and ministry. He lived from a common purse with the apostles, and passed on much to the poor. He lived on alms, or "church contributions", which excludes his life as a preacher from being interpreted as universal social law. He taught no scientific social system which could confuse us in seeing in him the spirit of voluntary poverty of the man perfected in the likeness of God, the beginnings of the eternal.

When preaching he warned against the danger of riches, and exhorted the rich to give. He used the word "give", but still he introduced into it the reciprocal service ideal, telling the rich to make friends to draw them into his eternal kingdom. Good rich men stand very close to him in the Gospel, Zaccheus and Joseph of Arimathea for instance.

So dominant was all this in the minds of the first disciples that they instituted a life of sharing without private property—which did not last. It could not be a consistent way of life unbacked by a productive system, and it was probably too much in expectation of the Second Coming. But it expressed two great truths. Christ had shown an ideal of voluntary poverty and sharing. The immediate memory of the Resurrection made flimsy any clinging to riches, status or power. One can follow the ideal, dwindling but not lost, in early Church history.

THE FIRST CENTURIES

During the first three centuries the Church lived without social theory, eschatologically, prepared for martyrdom, in a minority. St. Justin Martyr, for instance, only claims that in it people who loved wealth before "spread all their substance before their indigent brethren".

As this supremely detached state passed, the banner of voluntary poverty was carried by the ascetics and then the monks, and by the rich in others ways, release of slaves (sometimes in thousands on one manor), donation to the poor and confessors of the faith etc. . . . Within fifty years of the end of persecution St. Basil

had built a Christian charitable or social welfare town for the poor, aged, sick, travellers and all in need.

Involved in the decadent Roman system, itself set beyond possibility of change and fighting off the invasions that were to swamp it, the great Fathers adopted in general the attitude that private property, like slavery and autocracy in government, were effects of the state of sin and unavoidable in the circumstances. This implied no denial of the natural right to personal ownership seen later by the Church. They did not yet have a concept of nature in the later sense, but spoke of man in the state of Innocence and then of Sin. Their judgment was a situation one. Meantime they exhorted the rich to give. A very large part of the Commentaries of Chrysostom on Matthew runs upon this idea. Community ownership as an ideal developed rapidly in the extraordinary expansion of monasticism.

In the Middle Ages the Church became involved once more in a social order based on solidarity and trust ownership—a kind of socialism, if we remember the danger of using the word here. It was the nomad-to-agrarian mutation again, in Europe overrun by nomad tribes, re-forming on local groupings. From the customs of the Gothic tribes, with memories of the Roman manor, came feudalism. The ruler was the people, landowner, prince, welfare officer and magistrate in one. Everyone looked to him for maintenance in exchange for service. Ownership was in trust, from peasant to lord to king. Money had a different function from our money. There was less of it, more tribute and maintenance in kind. It was not used in investment as progressively creative and productive, but consumed in subsistence, war and display. (Hence the Church's stand against usury, payment for the loan of sterile money.) Even the display, the pageantry of mediaeval life, belonged not only to the rich but to the people. When the lord banqueted every one around joined in. Even his silk cloak belonged to them—as does the town band of a modern town to the people. Again it requires a complete transfer of mind to grasp it all.

In this system the Church was involved in two ways: first as landowner herself; secondly as minister of social welfare in a special way, in worship (seen as a necessary part of life), in provision of schools, poor relief, hostels for travellers, alms houses, hospitals, even roads and bridges. For this she received tithes.

SHIFT IN UNDERSTANDING

It was in this situation that the second great moral theology adjustment in matters of wealth was built up—in a society basically communitarian, but based on

the chief, not on official and bureaucratic organization. Socialist and communist ideas which appeared from the eleventh century received little sympathy, for they were, historically and de facto, connected with a reappearance of Manicheism and mystical movements that attacked the sacramental system, marriage and the outward organization of the Church. St. Thomas summed up the whole sense of this system when he used the simple formula: wealth should be individual in ownership, common in use, so as to be shared with all in need. The background is feudal trust ownership, not the absolute private right of later centuries. He defended this as necessity, not as ideal, much as the Fathers had done.

At the same time the ideal of communal ownership and personal voluntary poverty was kept alive through the wide extent of the monastic and religious life. Inevitably this led to too great a distinction between the attitude to wealth to special states and of the ordinary citizen-Christian. But even here the Middle ages had their own balances. Much of the lay apostolate of the times was developed through the Tertiary system in which laypeople were encouraged to associate their way of living as closely as possible with that of an order, Franciscan or Dominican or other, and so to value a spirit of voluntary poverty.

The mediaeval economic system had great faults, even if they have been overstated at times by naive evolutionary historians. Cupidity and ambition often took the place of sense of trust. But it was in theory and institutionally one with which the Church could come to terms, as not being grossly selfish. Identification with it however left Catholic social adjustment unprepared for the new economy that developed with banking and investment in trade in later middle ages, the new and powerful trade guilds and merchant class.

In the middle of this new crisis the Church was driven onto the defensive, and to an extremely traditional attitude, by the appearance of Protestantism. Involved as Chaplain to the vast Spanish-Portuguese colonial expansion, struggling for freedom with Catholic Kings and for faith with Protestant kings, looking backward to tradition for sound doctrine, the Church did not sufficiently note the great underlying economic changes.

In Europe the new artisan and middle class, entrenched on the absolute idea of private ownership, were obviously useful, social developers in an age without economic planning. Catholic thinkers did not sufficiently observe the change to this concept from that of trust ownership, nor did they understand the new productive use of money and the progressive accumulation of capital in the hands of the few. Even in

the direct duty of giving to those in need, the much lesser peasant poverty of the seventeenth century left social-moralists totally unprepared for horrifying poverty that developed with the new industrial areas.

THE COMING OF INDUSTRIALISM

When the crisis with industrialism began, and immediately and inevitably produced propaganda of human rights and socialism, all the first flight of theorists were either anti-Catholic or even anti-Christian. Paine, Godwin, Fichte, Saint Simon and Owen prepared the way for the declaration of total war by Marx and Engels. Socialism appeared as anti-God, and as violent revolution. Catholic thinkers, held mentally by the long history of establishment since Constantine, seeing the whole social order and Church system threatened, took their stand on the legitimacy of private property and only changed slowly.

Leo XIII defended private property, but only on condition of its proper distribution and proper wage rates. Pius XI suggested a middle way, socialised ownership of key sources of economic power, cooperative and corporate ownership in industry.

John XXIII accepted socialised ownership, provided it did not lead to depersonalisation. He saw and took up the challenge of the question of rich nations and poor nations as the unified world made it public, and called for the sharing of wealth, opportunities and access to raw materials, and free emigration and immigration, between countries rich and poor.

The Vatican Council seems to me, as already stated, to have filled up the gap there must always be between system and humanity and kindness by invitation to the Church and those who have more wealth to follow the voluntary poverty, and so the sharing, of Christ.

We must presumably refer to Marxist socialism the remark of John XXIII (*Pacem in Terris*. Sect 52. S.A.C.B.C. edition) that social movements that enter history attached to wrong philosophies of life can, in the evolution of history, shake off the wrong philosophy, and can express lawful human ideals. As industrial production tends to concentrate into large units, a new way of sharing its proceeds must be found. The new "nomad", with no assured individual support from land, but moving in search of wages and employment, needs more communalised provision for social security and welfare. We are ready it seems for the fullest dialogue with that element in socialism which should come so natural to a Christian, the idea of sharing goods. "The multitude of the believers were of one mind and one soul, and not one of them said that anything he possessed was his own, but they had all things in common.

And with great power did the apostles give testimony of the resurrection of Our Lord Jesus Christ. And great grace was in them all." (Acts. 4.) It would be equally wrong to make this into a universal economic principle, or to say that it was irrelevant to Christian living in any period.

SOCIALISM vs CAPITALISM

We can and must apply this principle of sharing or socialization not only within individual countries, but between countries in a world becoming unified into the form of immediate mutual relations and responsibility of a family. In this we must watch Utopian systems carefully. While socialism is producing some new forms of servitude, capitalism is in many ways humanising. Consultation is producing a form of democracy in industry, and a sharing of products and responsibility, even in some cases where the owners are technically a few. In Africa we might be specially interested in the concept being put forward under the title of African Socialism, especially by such men as Nyerere and Senghor. The latter, a great thinker, a Catholic and a student of Teilhard de Chardin, has put Marx firmly into his historical perspective. If this African socialism seems to have a characteristic, it is not so much to discuss forms of ownership, but to ensure that the first condition of acceptance of any venture, and the first charge upon it, is for the good of the community.

Here we must come back firmly to theology. Not only is it not the duty of the Church as such to plunge into selection among economic systems, but we must remember that its terms of reference in connection with any of them is their implications in moral justice and moral freedom. Also no Christian can expect man-made planning, law and system, to solve social problems, without interior change of heart. There is such a thing as sin and its bondage, not lifted from any human institution until it has come within the realm of grace. System will not redistribute wealth unless there are the effects of grace in a fear of wealth such as is taught by the parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus, and a love of sharing such as is taught the words of Acts quoted above, and an ideal of Christian poverty such as is taught by the Council. This does not mean any romantic poverty, nor inefficiency in work, but an attitude to the use of work's rewards in the form of wealth.

PERSONAL DESIRE OF WEALTH

Let us repeat. Two thirds of the world is permanently hungry. Thirty millions die every year of starvation. It is we Christians who are *de facto* the wealthy part of

the world. In many cases our own internal brotherhood and sharing is hardly good advertisement for Christianity. We have to put our own affairs in order, and have, perhaps only for a short time ahead, a major influence and responsibility in world affairs. The formula of Voluntary Poverty may be more useful and helpful in the specifically Christian approach to the situation than others such as social conscience or social sense. For it comes down to the point that what prevents the sharing of the wealth of the earth, and bedevils every systematized attempt to organize it, socialistically as in other ways, is personal desire of wealth. Until men fear to be comfortable while others are not, and dislike being comfortable while others are not, they will evade any plan or law made by man to restrict their selfishness.

There is, no doubt, a world evolution of social sense in this matter. It is sometimes pointed out that the machinery ensuring the better distribution of wealth, the wide distribution of political power in democracy, provides a force that only needs to work out ways and means; and again, that this movement towards democracy is only an expression of a more fundamental evolution in world consciousness: the idea of the dignity of the human person. But unfortunately there is back-slipping in this process, and it seems to me that to underpin hopes of the just distribution of wealth by confidence in democracy, or by confidence in human philosophical concepts, is to make your foundation no stronger than your superstructure. None of these things is safe unless through the Cross, Christ and grace. So while the Christian must enter fully into all such good human social and political movements, he may never feel them safe. He must finally rely on the way the Gospel works, by conversion in its truest sense, and in this matter on its spirit of voluntary poverty.

SHARING NOT AUSTERITY

This does not mean merely a detached individualism. Between his personal conversion, and the commitment to working in politics which is his civic duty, the Christian belongs to other communities: the Church, the eschatological community, and social and cultural groupings of people of like interests. Voluntary Poverty as it is thought of here is in terms of the Community shown in *Acts*, in terms of sharing rather than of austerity. It was as communities that Christians infused a new faith into the Roman Empire, and the formation of voluntary associations of like-minded people could be the chief means spreading the spirit in this matter.

Again it does not mean a haphazard or unscientific

use of surplus goods for others, giving in such a way as to create pauperisation, but sharing opportunity, and capital, if one must have the word, in such a way that they can work and earn for themselves, and so become fully self supporting and responsible.

Nowhere in the world must people be forced so directly to reflect upon human unity as in this country, with its two nations and two standards of living, and its barrier to perception and understanding in colour xenophobia. All this can be turned into opportunity rather than tragedy, if taken as the meaningful call of God in our situation.

Nowhere it seems to me is the formula of voluntary poverty more necessary. I hesitate to set down some of what comes now, for it is a little too easy for a member of an Order, with no family and with assured security in his community, to speak of lay responsibility. However, we are a teaching faculty . . .

The South African white needs a spirit of voluntary poverty because the concession of a higher standard of living to the non-white means a proportionate reduction in his standard of living for which he must vote. Overseas the artisan and his assistant are paid in the ratio of about sixty percent to forty percent. Here it is more like eighty five to fifteen. To compete economically in international markets South Africa cannot pay more than a hundred percent wages. So apart from any spreading of wealth by industrial development, the Europeans' share must decrease, by his own sovereign vote.

He needs the same spirit because sincere people on both sides of the main sociological cleavage in the country, partitionists and integrationists, find it difficult to believe in each other's sincerity, since both are, as a whole, taking full advantage of the wealth coming to them through the low pay of non-Europeans associated in work with them. Possibly the first thing needed is for some to "clean themselves", to use only what they would receive in a just distribution of wealth, and use the rest for the "cause". Groups, so acting, would have a tremendous force by communication of ideal.

CULTURAL WEALTH

Acting together would help them to face up to further forms of "impoverishment" they would meet. There is the ostracism that convinced action, private and political, always brings to people in such circumstances as ours. There is fear of loss of the subtlest form of wealth, cultural wealth, to be faced—a "temptation so high that heavenward thoughts alight on it". To become just South Africa may have to face a loss of various forms of social efficiency and cultural preferences that are even nearer life than wealth in goods, and which can wrongfully be set as value higher than justice and

charity. That the fear is largely false, that European culture would actually be in many ways enriched by Africanising, is beyond the ability of most people to see. There is finally for the whole Church as a body, apart from the Christian's position as a citizen, the need to be ready to face impoverishment in buildings, institutions and organisation available to the better-off, if it becomes progressively more unpopular by a stand for justice, and if it internally shares all resources, and its social life, more fully.

Every situation is a vocation, and every problem an opportunity. We should perhaps thank God that "signs of the times" of which the Council spoke, the world concentration on the values of the dignity of the human person and the community of man, are more urgently present to us than in many other parts of the world. We have also, in the near-hopeless prospect of working to change social attitudes in South Africa, and to bring about a sharing of wealth and life's opportunities, an example of how the Christian must work in such matters: not considering whether he is likely to be successful or not, but making sure he does what is right and leaving the result to God.

"The men of the East that read the stars
may signs and omens mark;
but the men that drink the blood of God
go gaily in the dark."

In all this South Africa makes a focal point in which to consider what Christians everywhere should be thinking of in their rich Christian countries: of the same spirit of poverty in willingness to accept impoverishment in wealth, in "face", in ability to demand gratitude and conformity for service, even in the exclusive richness of their own civilisation, if they are to share more with the poorer world. ●

JOHN DUGARD is Senior Lecturer in Law at the University of the Witwatersrand.

FR. COLIN COLLINS, a regular contributor to our columns, has recently returned from a three-month's trip to the United States, sponsored by the Carnegie Foundation.

FR. S. J. ENGERING, O.P., is the Editor of the Afrikaans-language, Catholic monthly, *Die Brug*.

EDWARD HIGGINS, lecturer in sociology at the University of Natal, contributes a regular column to these pages.

FR. DALE WHITE is full-time warden of the Wilgespruit Centre, the ecumenical meeting-place sponsored by the Witwatersrand Christian Council.

FR. FINBARR SYNNOTT O.P. lectures at St. Peter's Seminary at Hammanskraal in the Northern Transvaal. He points out that 'so many new ideas were introduced into the second part of this article when it was read to the Johannesburg branch of the Kolbe Association that I should acknowledge the debt, without making anyone but myself responsible for its general meaning.'

BODE WEGERIE is an administrative executive with a Johannesburg publishing company.

PUBLISHED BY THE EDITOR A. P. GOLLER, 703 CAROLDENE, SOPER ROAD, BEREA, JOHANNESBURG AND PRINTED BY SHERRY & SHERRY PTY. LTD.—77823

Collection Number: AD2533

Collection Name: South African Institute of Race Relations, Collection of publications, 1932-1979

PUBLISHER:

Publisher: Historical Papers Research Archive, University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, South Africa

Location: Johannesburg

©2017

LEGAL NOTICES:

Copyright Notice: All materials on the Historical Papers website are protected by South African copyright law and may not be reproduced, distributed, transmitted, displayed, or otherwise published in any format, without the prior written permission of the copyright owner.

Disclaimer and Terms of Use: Provided that you maintain all copyright and other notices contained therein, you may download material (one machine readable copy and one print copy per page) for your personal and/or educational non-commercial use only.

This collection forms part of the archive of the South African Institute of Race Relations (SAIRR), held at the Historical Papers Research Archive, University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, South Africa.