

## ERKLÄRUNG DER SÜDAFRIKANISCHEN BISCHÖFE ÜBER DIE APARTHEID

*Im folgenden bringen wir den vollen Wortlaut der Erklärung, welche die südafrikanischen Bischöfe nach ihrer vorjährigen Plenarkonferenz im Juli abgegeben haben. Der Text stammt aus THE SOUTHERN CROSS (36, 1957 vom 17. Juli 1957), die Auszeichnungen durch Kursivsatz sind von der Redaktion.*

In 1952 the Catholic bishops of South Africa issued a statement on race relations which emphasised the evil of a colour discrimination and the injustices which flow from it. This statement maintained that *non-Europeans* in South Africa had a *strict right in justice to evolve towards full participation in the political, economic and cultural life of the country*. It pointed out, however, that this evolution could not take place unless the people concerned made their own vigorous contribution towards fitting themselves for the exercise of full citizenship.

Five years have gone by since this statement was issued. During that time there has been no change of direction in South Africa's racial policy. Rather, the old policy of segregation, responsible in large measure for the social pattern of the country, has under the name of *apartheid* received clearer definition and more precise application. Apartheid is officially held to be the only possible formula for South Africa's mixed society. Integration is considered unthinkable and partition into separate states impracticable.

The basic principle of apartheid is the preservation of what is called white civilization. This is identified with white supremacy, which means the enjoyment by white men only of full political, social, economic and cultural rights. Persons of other race must be satisfied with what the white man judges can be conceded to them without endangering his privileged position. White supremacy is an absolute. It overrides justice. It transcends the teaching of Christ. It is a purpose dwarfing every other purpose, an end justifying any means.

Apartheid is sometimes described as separate development, a term which suggests that under apartheid different races are given the opportunity of pursuing their respective and distinctive social and cultural evolutions. It is argued that only in this manner will these races be doing the will of God, lending themselves to the fulfilment of His providential designs.

The contention sounds plausible as long as we overlook an important qualification, namely, that separate development is subordinate to white supremacy. The white man makes himself the agent of God's will and the interpreter of His providence in assigning the range and determining the bounds of non-white development. *One trembles at the blasphemy of thus attributing to God the offences against charity and justice that are apartheid's necessary accompaniment.*

It is a sin to humiliate one's fellow man. There is in each human person, by God's creation, a dignity inseparably connected with his quality of rational and free being. This dignity has been immeasurably enhanced by the mystery of our redemption. In the words of St. Peter we are „a chosen race, a royal



priesthood, a consecrated nation" (1 Petr II, 9). Christ Himself has said: "I have called you my friends" (John XV, 15).

No man has the right to despise what God has honoured, to belittle one whom Christ has called friend, to brand a fellow man with the stigma of inborn inferiority. It is an *insult to human dignity*, a *slur upon God's noble work* of creation and redemption.

Christ has warned us against inflicting such injuries: "... any man who says Raca to his brother must answer for it before the Council; and any man who says to his brother, Thou fool, must answer for it in hell fire" (Matth V, 22).

From this fundamental evil of apartheid flow the innumerable offences against charity and justice that are its inevitable consequence, for men must be hurt and injustice must be done when the practice of discrimination is enthroned as the supreme principle of the welfare of the state, the ultimate law from which all other laws derive.

This condemnation of the principle of apartheid as something intrinsically evil does not imply that perfect equality can be established in South Africa by a stroke of the pen. There is nothing more obvious than the existence of profound differences between sections of our population which make immediate total integration impossible. People cannot share fully in the same political and economic institutions until culturally they have a great deal in common.

All social change must be gradual if it is not to be disastrous. Nor is it unjust for a state to make provision in its law and administration for the differences that do exist. A state must promote the well-being of all its citizens. If some require special protection it must be accorded.

It would be unreasonable, therefore, to condemn indiscriminately all South African differential legislation. It would be unfair to disparage the services provided for less advanced sections of the population and the noble and dedicated labours of many public officials on their behalf.

Many who suffer under the sting of apartheid find it hard to accept counsels of moderation. Embittered by insult and frustration, they distrust any policy that involves a gradual change. Revolution not evolution is their slogan. They can see redress only in the sweeping away of every difference and the immediate extension of full civil rights to all.

They do not stop to contemplate the confusion that will ensue, the collapse of all public order, the complete dissolution of society and perhaps their own rapid destruction in the holocaust. This is particularly true of those who find in atheistic Communism the inspiration of their present striving and their hope for the future.

A *gradual change* it must be: gradual, for no other kind of change is compatible with the maintenance of order, without which there is no society, no government, no justice, no common good.

But a change must come, for otherwise our country faces a disastrous future. That change could be initiated immediately if the ingenuity and energy now expended on apartheid were devoted to making South Africa a happy country for all its citizens. The time is short. The need is urgent. Those penalised by apartheid must be given concrete evidence of the change before it is too late.

This involves the elaboration of a *sensible and just policy enabling any person*, irrespective of race, to qualify for the enjoyment of full civil rights. To achieve this will undoubtedly take statesmanship of high order, for the difficulties are not to be minimised. It is no easy matter to dispel fears and



prejudices and introduce measures so contrary to the main trends and customs of the past.

Obviously no South African Government can attempt such a change without the consent of the White citizens. On their shoulders lies squarely the burden of responsibility. Let them examine their conscience in the light of Christ's teaching.

Let them read again the words of the Master: „I have a new commandment to give you, that you are to love one another, that your love for one another is to be like the love I have borne you. The mark by which all men will know you for My disciples will be the love you bear for one another“ (John XIII, 34, 35).

Are we not making a mockery of Christianity by proclaiming ourselves a Christian nation and pursuing a policy so contrary to these words of Christ?

To our beloved Catholic people of White race, we have a special word to say.

The *practice of segregation* though officially not recognized *in our churches*, characterizes, nevertheless, many of our church societies, our schools, seminaries, convents, hospitals and the social life of our people. In the light of Christ's teaching this cannot be tolerated for ever. The time has come to pursue more vigorously the change of heart and practice that the law of Christ demands. We are hypocrites if we condemn apartheid in South African society and condone it in our own institutions.

This does *not* mean that we can easily *disregard all differences of mentality, condition, language and social custom*. The Church does not enforce human associations that, because for these differences, can produce no good. She understands that the spiritual welfare of her children cannot be fostered in a social atmosphere wholly alien and uncongenial.

But the Christian duty remains of seeking to unite rather than separate, to dissolve differences rather than perpetuate them. A different colour can be no reason for separation when culture, custom, social condition and, above all, a common faith and common love of Christ impel towards unity.

We give expression to these observations in the knowledge that the faith and charity of our people will prompt a truly Christian consideration of them and, in due course, behaviour in full conformity with the teaching of our Saviour. We have every reason for this confidence because we have before our eyes a great proof of the loyalty and generosity of our people in the magnificent response to the Catholic Bishops' Campaign for Mission Schools and Seminaries.

To all White South Africans we direct an earnest plea to consider carefully what apartheid means, its evil and anti-Christian character, the injustices that flow from it, the resentment and bitterness it arouses, the harvest of disaster that it must produce in the country we all love so much.

We cannot fail to express our admiration for the splendid work done in many quarters to lessen prejudice, promote understanding and unity and help South Africa along that path of harmony and co-operation which is the only one dictated by wisdom and justice.

On the other hand, we deeply regret that it is still thought necessary to add to the volume of restrictive and oppressive legislation in order to reduce contacts between various groups to an inhuman and unnatural minimum.

We pray God that minds may be enlightened to see the truth without regard to the prejudices and hearts encouraged to act of the past. It will take



sacrifice. Yet sacrifice need not deter us whose forefathers have left us the heritage of their bravery.

The purpose before us now is one of the noblest causes we could embrace: the *Triumph of Christ in our country's laws and customs*, in the spirit of that hope recently expressed by His Holiness Pope *Pius XII*: „that a task of constructive collaboration may be carried out in Africa: a collaboration free of prejudices and mutual sensitiveness, preserved from the seductions and strictures of false nationalism, and capable of extending to people rich in resources and future the true values of Christian civilization which have already borne so many fruits in other continents.“

## BERICHTE

### LÖWENER MISSIOLOGISCHE WOCHE 27.—30. AUG. 1957

Eine festgegründete Tradition, aber auch ein überaus wichtiges Thema führten etwa 250 Teilnehmer (von ihnen wenigstens ein Viertel Schwestern) in das altehrwürdige Maria-Theresia-Kolleg der Löwener Universität für die 27. Missiologische Woche zusammen. Das Hauptthema lautete: Der Kommunismus und die Missionen, oder besser gesagt: Der Kommunismus in den Missionsländern; denn der Zusammenhang zwischen beiden Extremen, die Rückwirkung der Mission auf die Bedrohung des Kommunismus wurde nur vorübergehend herangezogen; im Zukunftsbild, das am Schluß gezeigt wurde, wurden sogar Rückschlüsse auf die gegenwärtige Missionsmethode überflüssig genannt, etwa im Sinne: Wir haben vom Kommunismus nichts zu erlernen. Gewiß eine bedauerliche Voreingenommenheit!

Im Referat des Generalsekretärs P. Masson SJ wurde die neue Missionslage charakterisiert als die Stunde des autochthonen Elementes und als die Phase der Dienstbarkeit: „Partnership in Obedience“ — wie der Wahlspruch des „International Mission Council“ seit dem letzten Krieg lautet, „Begegnung über die Grenzen“ — wie das Thema des Pax-Romana-Kongresses in Angers in diesem Jahre heißt. Am Anfang gab der Dozent an der Löwener Universität, M. Ladrière, einen geschichtlichen Überblick über den marxistischen Gedanken. P. Bigo SJ, der Direktor der „Action Populaire“ (Paris), konfrontierte am dritten Tage für die Teilnehmer aus eigener Erfahrung den Kommunismus mit dem christlichen Gewissen. Es war eine grundlegende Auseinandersetzung mit der Ideologie und der modernen Mentalität des Kommunismus. Im Verlaufe der Tagung wurde der Stand der kommunistischen Bewegung in den einzelnen Missionsländern erörtert: in Ost-, West-, Zentral-(Kamerun, Sudan und Kongo) und Südafrika, Madagascar, Syrien, China (P. Boutsen OFM und der Scheutvelder P. Schyns gaben eindrucksvolle Schilderungen des kommunistischen Terrors), Japan (P. Jos. Spaë CICM, Generalsekretär des „Committee of the Apostolate“ in Japan, gab ein schönes Referat), Vietnam, Indonesien (P. Koendjono SJ behandelte die aktuelle Situation nach dem kommunistischen Siege bei der Provinzwahl auf Java), Pakistan und Indien.