

FACE TO FACE WITH JUSTICE A BIG TASK FOR ORDINARY PEOPLE

A CHRISTIAN POLITICAL OPTION FOR FIJI

Bob Goudzwaard

Driebergen, The Netherlands

Edited and Adapted with the Assistance of

Bruce Wearne

Point Lonsdale, Australia

&

Robert Wolfgramm

Vuci Road, Nausori, Viti Levu Fiji

Translated by Revd Herman Praamsma

Holland Christian Homes, Brampton, Ontario

Originally published Anti-Revolutionary Party, The Hague, The Netherlands as *Grote Taak voor Kleine mensen* 1969. The initial translated edition was published as *A Christian Political Option* by Wedge Publishing Foundation, Toronto, Canada 1972. This edition authorised by the author, with permission of translator and Wedge Publishing Foundation (Mr Kerry Hollingsworth, Grand Rapids, MI, USA), as *Face to Face with Justice: a Big Task for Ordinary People - a Christian Political Option for Fiji and the South Pacific*
© 2009 Fiji Daily Post, Suva. Republic of Fiji Islands.

Introduction

The cover of the 1972 edition indicates that the publisher saw an international potential for this Dutch handbook. "It is a necessary manual for all those who are striving for a reformation of politics in Canada, the U.S, England and Australia." This was 27 years after the end of World War II and the Canadian publishers had perceived a niche, a potential market, in the larger Dutch migration movement that also included Australia and New Zealand. In time, this book has proved fruitful. It has been a stimulus to a group known as Citizens for Public Justice in Canada with a sister US body, Center for Public Justice, in Washington. This work has been read with appreciation in both Australia and New Zealand but it has not resulted in any comparable Christian public justice movement.

The re-publication of this book for Fiji at this time reflects a similar sense of urgency that brought about its original North American publication back in 1972. Initially it had been written as part of the Dutch Anti-Revolutionary Party's reconsideration of its own political tradition. In translation, the arguments are re-directed to a general and global readership, and so the immediate Dutch political context is left somewhat in the background. However, Goudzwaard's confrontation and critique of his own tradition can be clearly "over-heard" in this book even if it is not explicit. It does not become apparent unless the reader specifically goes looking for it. Consider, as an example, the following statement that explains the purpose of Chapter 4: *Contemporary Christian Social Reflection*.

For the delineation of our own conception concerning Christian social reflection and action, it is important to pay some attention to developments in other Christian circles. Here we have in mind the on-going reflection within the World Council of Churches and the Roman Catholic Church, especially the pronouncements of the Second Vatican Council (p.21).

Note the phrase: "to pay attention to developments in other Christian circles". What this shows us is that this book was written with the assumption that a political party's self-appraisal has to relate to the way others understand the political task and in particular how other Christians - outside their own immediate members - can contribute to their own reflection and work.

The educational aim of **Grote Taak (Big Task)** was that **within this** notable Dutch Christian **political party**, the ongoing political work of promoting a Christian option had to find its own form of Christian political ecumenicity. We can't learn from, or positively disagree with, other Christians **politically** if we do not listen to what they are saying and hear how they defend and also revise their own political stances across the entire gamut of political issues. On the other hand, Christians will not have much of a political ecumenicity if they do not have a well worked out platform and policies to go with it.

Big Task was originally written with an awareness of the teaching of the two most powerful Christian bodies, operative in the international arena, the Roman Catholic church and the World Council of Churches; both must have an impact upon how Christians in various denominational contexts promote distinctively

Christian politics.¹

So why are we bothering to re-publish a Fiji version of **Big Task** forty years after it first appeared? Here we quote from a recent article by the Reverend James Bhagwan:

In my travels, as I reflect on what I see, what I experience, one of the saddest realisation[s] for me is, as our nation lurches from crisis to crisis, from conflict to conflict, that the majority of [the] people involved call themselves Christians. We research, hold meetings and create documents, with pillars that are supposed to ensure change, peace and progress whgen we ignore the most important pillar for peace - the command to love one another as God in Christ loved us² (James Bhagwan "A Time to Renew Trust" Fiji Times Wednesday, December 31, 2008.)

James Bhagwan puts his finger on a serious problem. Is the reason that Christians are found on all sides in Fiji's current political crisis because they simply do not believe they can think politically as Christians? What has loving one another as Christ loved us to do with politics, let alone resolving the political impasse in which Fiji now finds itself? The answer given by **Big Task** is that politics is one of the God-given ways in which we not only show our love for our neighbour; it is one of the ways that God calls us to demonstrate our love for God's ways! This is the way of seeking for justice. That, in brief, explains why we are re-issuing a Fiji version of this book.

Chapter I, "**A Necessary Risk**", presents a viewpoint which is remarkably current 40 years after its initial publication. Indeed the term "risk" joined to the concept of "structuration" reminds us of the contribution of Anthony Giddens, one of the architects of "third way" politics which has been a not altogether successful attempt to rediscover human responsibility at the centre of political life. This initial chapter introduces the big arena which confronts us with our diverse human responsibilities on various levels (local, regional, national, international) as well as in various domains (marriage and family, the political community of State and citizens, business and industry, education and schooling, church). How is governmental authority to be exercised within this social complexity, in which political life is only one of the ways we express our common humanity? What are the true limits of political life?

The political arena is so complex and demands knowledge of so many different factors and circumstances that one can easily "miss the mark" in one's decisions. Political mistakes are frightening because politics decisively influences the lives of millions. Hence politics, whether in word or deed, is always a very risky undertaking (p.1).

But despite the risks, our responsibility is unavoidable because it is **one** of the ways in which we as people depend on and relate to each other. Head-in-the-sand politics is not non-political, it is simply bad politics, and *even if we aren't concerned with the gospel in politics, the gospel is concerned about our political activities.* Christians confess that, as

¹ A more recent 2001 Document of the World Council of Churches, the World Alliance of Reformed Churches, and the Pacific Conference of Churches is "The Island of Hope: an Alternative to Economic Globalization" is also relevant in our South Pacific context and is found at <http://www.oikoumene.org/fileadmin/files/wcc-main/documents/p3/dossier-7.pdf>

² Editor's note: Corrections inserted.

citizens, they are already actively involved in politics. This does not mean that all are politically activists but as citizens we have a duty to confront and to live in the unmistakable tension between our failures (past and present) and our task. What then, we should ask, was the immediate manifestation of this tension in the lives and reflections of Christians seeking a political option? In the wake of WWII, one of Goudzwaard's fellow Christian thinkers put it this way

*What then are we to say? Amidst the ruins of our nation's existence and the rubble of western civilization it is hardly fitting for us to beat the drums. Surely, this is not the time for sounding the battle cry. The (recognition of our failings) can only be **confessed**, as always, in recognition of the complete solidarity of Christian and nonchristian alike in the sin and guilt of mankind, the same sin and guilt which recently led the world to the brink of destruction (Herman Dooyeweerd Roots of Western Culture: Pagan, Secular and Christian Options. Wedge 1979 p. 3).*

The risk therefore is of a intensely spiritual character - to face up to the tragic and monumental failures of politics - Christian politics included.

Chapter II, **Current Political Problems**, explains that political decision-making is faced by various contemporary issues which cannot be avoided. The discussion is framed to illustrate the prevailing pragmatism that serves to deepen the political problems of the age; for pragmatism, politics is simply a matter of responding to the problems once they have become politically obvious. According to pragmatic criteria, the best politician is the one who can feel the 'current' situation and has a ready explanation at hand to explain what is to be done. Goudzwaard in this chapter aims to expose the superficiality of pragmatism - it is a deception and a real danger in politics.

Political activity dictated by what the situation itself seems to 'demand' amounts to nothing less than an abandonment of our specific political calling. Such a calling isn't a matter of merely following events; it's a matter of shaping these events (p.5).

The chapter briefly reviews these demands that require scrupulous examination, and so in a way that clarifies the path of justice. Some of these are: economic development and wealth in the west and the yawning gulf between rich and poor; population growth; ongoing technological development in the economy; increasing power domination in economic life; world-wide confrontation and the threat of war.

Now of course this was written to help supporters of a major political party in a small European country that was still recovering from the privations of the depression and the war. Fijian readers will have to read this with sharp perception since any application to current South West Pacific problems needs to identify the underlying principles that are required in any political search for public justice.

Chapter III **Movements of our Times** considers the basic doctrines of "Today's Socialism", "Today's Libertarianism", "Today's Communism" and "Pragmatism". It is useful to be reminded, in basic and schematic terms, of the different political options that were then alive and are still alive and well around the globe. Political parties and their elected representatives, should not avoid stating clearly where they

stand. Where a candidate stands is actually where he or she is prepared to lose an election if need be. To try and get elected by avoiding clarity is a recipe for political confusion. And very often the greatest confusion in politics is promoted by those who win at all costs. To win at all costs is to lose sight of principles.

[One only has to look at the politicians who are now running Fiji's post-December 2006 coup. The problem is they cannot, like genuinely elected politicians, handle political criticism. Their complaints about the critics of their administration contrast with their attempt to say that it is the politicians who have caused Fiji's problems. To take political office one is taking responsibility for the problems that are part and parcel of political life. To understand Fiji's political movements is no easy task.]

Goudzwaard exposes the emptiness when post-modern existentialism confronts pragmatism in consumer society, but again the perspective of **Big Task** will help those who are trying to come to terms with the ideological development of neo-liberalism since the collapse of the Soviet empire in the late 1980s³. These have been decades when a neo-liberal vision for globalisation has risen to dominance; it also marks the years of Fiji's struggle with 'coup culture'. **Big Task** provides some pointers for developing insight into Fiji's political anxieties over this period, and our re-issuing of the volume in Fiji is also with a view to assisting and encouraging Christian students of history, politics, economics and sociology to get busy and to find ways of articulating an authentic South West Pacific Christian political economy.

The translation of the opening paragraph of Chapter IV, **Contemporary Christian Social Reflection** has already been discussed. This chapter briefly reviews the developing political passivity of the World Council of Churches, which had been challenged by the political action among South American Christians (some of which was associated with Christian democratic political parties), and also the situation of dissenting Christians behind the Iron Curtain. Again, the re-issuing of this book is not to suggest that there have been no significant development since the 1960s, but to indicate the kind of openness that Christian scholarship needs to adopt toward the reflections of others, near and far. Throughout the text we have included "windows" where quotations and examples are given to provoke Fijian reflection about the ongoing work of seeking justice for all our neighbours and how that relates to the hope of the Gospel.

There is also discussion of Roman Catholic developments since the Second Vatican Council and in particular in the view of human society outside of the church in the so-called 'temporal' or 'secular' realms. Such teaching speaks about co-operation between Christian and non-Christian in common political action, as well as a more progressive view of the church's duty to 'promote' and not just 'protect' the public interest. This has arisen from a revival of natural law doctrines and has implications for a new understanding of global federalism, development aid and property relations.

³ See also "The Island of Hope: An Alternative to Economic Globalization" as a response of South Pacific Christian churches to the emergence of globalization under neo-liberal impetus after the collapse of communism.

[One wonders whether Archbishop Mataka's decision to join the 'People's Charter' movement was on the basis of such a construal of his responsibilities as head of the Roman Catholic communion in the post-coup political situation. One also thinks of the implicit support for the coup given by Fr Kevin Barr. To really debate these matters, Christians will need a greater openness to each other, but also to be very clear about the basis for their attempted contributions. If such openness is not present then one cannot be criticised and so political dialogue is short-circuited].

In Chapter V, **The Unique Radicality of the Gospel**, Goudzwaard addresses a diverse audience. To the "conservative" members of his party he affirms that the gospel is the only sure basis for political ecumenicity. Some "liberal" members of his party had imbibed the idea that politics was a religiously neutral realm and so really they were suggesting that Christian politics was a mistake. That approach finds itself adapting the gospel to advance commonly accepted goals. Goudzwaard's discussion is headed in a different direction.

Christian politics comes into its own when we open ourselves up to the power of the gospel. It is not an artificial inflation of our own egos with the aid of a set of a-political, edifying niceties, but a spontaneous following of the gospel as it continually confronts us and others with a decisive choice in the midst of contemporary political problems: a choice between life and death, between hope and despair, between light and darkness (p.29).

The chapter exposes the underlying failures of the parties "Christian politics", its joyless legalism, its utopian effort to build a bridge between the gospel and politics.

*To put it differently, political activity in which we see it as **our** task to bridge the 'gap' between the gospel and politics, has little to do with real Christian politics (p.26).*

The light burden stage of evangelical politics has not been reached. That is what Goudzwaard suggests should be the goal of those seeking a Christian political option. You'll recall what Jesus said about following Him - **my yoke is easy and my burden is light**.

The gospel is confessed in politics not to confront others, but in order that we confront ourselves and find the path of discipleship. Political recipes are avoided and instead the aim is to aid *gospel-directed formation of contemporary political judgment* (p.30). In the formulation of its programme, a Christian political party finds itself ever and again confronted by the gospel and it is in this sense that *a Christian political party **never** excels other parties...*(p.29).

Various political efforts in Fiji have carried the "Christian" banner. The love of neighbour, as Jesus taught it in the parable of the Good Samaritan, is often referred to as the bedrock basis for Fijian politics. James Bhagwan in his recent article, quoted above, is the most recent Christian leader to give expression to this notion. This Chapter of **Big Task** can help us understand why "love of neighbour" is indeed basic to authentic Christian political activity.

Chapter VI **Selection of Political Ideas** begins with a discussion of "Ideas as empty cartridges" which suggests that left and right political options often use exactly the same terminology.

... concepts like liberty, free development of the personality, etc., are often no more than empty cartridges, which receive their charge completely from the world view to which one adheres.

For contemporary Fiji, waiting to hear when the next parliamentary election will be held, we might include "moving forward" as one of those empty cartridges. All political sides, including the Interim Regime, will want to "move the country forward". After all, none will admit to wanting to take the country backward? But what do the voices actually mean?

The question of course is: which charge? Which world view will give content to one's "political cartridges". The discussion proceeds to provide an overview of how humanity is viewed in politics and how politics must be an expression of love for neighbour. The definition of prosperity is also examined and reductionistic and materialistic views are compared with the bible's view of shalom. The question of liberty is expounded.

... the highest goal of a political program which is gripped by the liberty of the gospel can never be that people receive the greatest possible room to manoeuvre to do or not to do what they feel like. Rather, this kind of politics would be intent on letting life unfold along the lines of restored relationships (pp. 34-5).

In Chapters V and VI, it becomes apparent that Goudzwaard is addressing a complex party situation in his own country. These chapters need to be read carefully. Part of the problem is the assumption that Christian politics needs 'learned treatises' about 'Christian topics' (see the quote from James Bhagwan once again). Goudzwaard's own goal is not to provide a new kind of 'derived' principle, but

... to make clear that every politician, whether he is a Christian or not, even in the most complicated political decisions acts out of certain motives, certain views, out of a certain notion of what norms his decisions.

The aim is to describe the basic ideas of political decision-making. In this sense, the gospel confronts all citizens, all government officials, all elected representatives. Chapters VII and VIII therefore, attempts to outline what such political choice are - Chapter VII discusses the responsibility of governments to ensure justice and peace and hence to engage in defense and security, alleviate poverty at home and abroad and find ways to combat the negative impacts of diverse ideologies. The final two sections discuss the way pragmatism is consonant with ideology and the way demonic powers maintain a grip upon prosperous societies. Chapter VIII discusses political economy at home and abroad, exploring the government's role in overcoming structural injustice. The first step is a criticism of the prevailing architecture of society - an 'Architectonic critique' (pp.48-9). When this issue is raised 'at home', a government cannot avoid the independence of national life with the international context, and a concern for structural injustice reaches beyond one's own country, and one's own national interests, and takes in account the inter-

connections with all other peoples across the globe. 'Development aid' is discussed as part of the choice between what is and what ought to be. This brings the discussion to a consideration of the corporation, the corporation as a community, the purpose of business and ownership in relation to free enterprise.

Chapter IX **The formation of political opinion** is a discussion of how political judgments are to be formed in day to day politics. The crucial activity involves *searching out, testing, and harmonizing needs*. Now after all that has been said in the book to this point it seems rather a strange thing to say, until it is realized that Goudzwaard is here talking about the hard work of being responsive to the constituency who has voted for candidates standing on a Christian party's platform.

The searching out of needs involves an effort to understand the who one is proposing to represent. In this sense the political party needs to form policies that relate to the various responsibilities of electors in their day-to-day life. Politics is about policies to promote just governance.

The final Chapter X **The formation of a Christian party** reiterates the fact that the book has been seeking to respond to what

the gospel itself through its own initiative, presents as the choice - a choice it continually places before the politician in the midst of his/her political activity. ...Whether to form a party should be determined by asking if it is the most effective instrument, in a given time and place, to implement the demands of the gospel in politics. Thus a Christian political party is no more than one of the organizational forms available for evangelical political activity. It can never be an end in itself and neither should it be (p.63).

The decision to launch a party must consider the electoral system of a country, the character of existing parties, the knowledge and insight of the Christian community. Reviewing the arguments in favour of Christian party formation, Goudzwaard concludes this 66 page book with *a conditional yes*, a provisional affirmation of the importance of Christian political organizations.

*And that conditional element is related to two things; in the first place, whether a Christian party remains willing to recognize the possibility of its own failure (and consequently rejects all temptations to identify its program with the message of the gospel which transcends **all** programs); and secondly, whether it is and remains willing actually to open itself to the penetrating work of the gospel. Otherwise it has little in common with the Christian faith except its name, and makes a laughing stock out of the gospel (p.65-6).*

And so, the book ends on this note:

Both these conditions are essentially marching orders, tasks, and responsibilities. Don't let anyone tell you that Christian political action is obsolete. There will always be room for real evangelical political action; the gospel is always active in politics and in the entirety of life (p. 66).

So that's a summary of the book. There will be those who will ask why this book is needed here in Fiji at this time? Aren't there more important issues to consider than simply going over the same old stuff about Christian politics which doesn't seem to get resolved anyway? Hasn't Christianity been used to justify the overthrow of governments? Hasn't it been used to promote racism?

Firstly, **Face to Face with Justice** is put forward to encourage all of Fiji's citizens, and Fiji's neighbours near and far, to think seriously about their political responsibilities. Secondly, it is made available to help Fiji's various political parties think about the role and task of political parties in Fiji's political community. Thirdly, it is made available to Fiji's *Christian* political parties, as they think over their own platforms and policies, as they reflect upon their own successes and failures, and as they seek to encourage a genuine Christian citizenship in Fiji's public domain. This also means finding the just path to an open society where all neighbours are served with justice - not a justice which derives from what we think "others" deserve but the justice that God requires of us in treating our neighbour, those who like ourselves share God's Image.

Face to Face with Justice: A Big Task for Ordinary People is offered here to assist citizens think about their contributions to the mix of Fiji's current political debate. It is offered with a prayer that disciples of Jesus Christ may discover His gentle leading on the path of justice.

Bruce Wearne bcwearne@ozemail.com.au,

Robert Wolfgramm, robert.wolfgramm@gmail.com Fiji Daily Post,

Bob Goudzwaard bob.goudzwaard@ext.vu.nl

February 2009

We believe that God has intervened decisively in and through Jesus Christ, who is very God Himself and yet who became a real human being in that act of stupendous divine condescension called the Incarnation - God becoming man. By this act, God declared that human history is important, and that all of human life is important.

Archbishop Desmond Tutu "The Divine Intention"
Address to the Eloff Commission of Inquiry, South Africa, 1/9/1982.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction	ii
I. A NECESSARY RISK.....	4
Christian politics can miss the mark	4
An unavoidable gamble	5
A dated mission	5
II. CURRENT POLITICAL PROBLEMS.....	7
Political determinants.....	7
Increasing national income.....	8
Increasing population.....	9
Increasing technical knowledge.....	10
Increasing power formation in economic life.....	10
Increasing confrontation between East and West.....	11
Increasing threat of war.....	12
Concluding remarks.....	12
III. MOVEMENTS OF OUR TIMES.....	15
Today's socialism.....	15
Today's libertarianism.....	16
Today's communism.....	17
Pragmatism.....	18
IV. CONTEMPORARY CHRISTIAN SOCIAL REFLECTION.....	21
World Council of Churches.....	21
The Second Vatican Council.....	22
V. THE UNIQUE RADICALITY OF THE GOSPEL.....	25
Derived principles.....	26
The gospel as power.....	27
Program.....	28
VI. SELECTION OF POLITICAL IDEAS.....	31
Ideas as empty cartridges.....	31
Which charge?.....	31
Politics and humanity.....	32
Politics and prosperity.....	33
Politics and liberty.....	33
Politics and authority.....	35
The idea of the state.....	36
Sphere sovereignty.....	37
No new derived principles.....	37
VII. THE CHOICE BETWEEN PEACE AND DEMONIC POWER.....	39
The role of demonic power in war.....	40
Ideology and pragmatism.....	41
The role of demonic power in a prosperous society.....	42
VIII. THE CHOICE BETWEEN WHAT IS AND WHAT OUGHT TO BE.....	44
Architectonic criticism.....	44
Developmental aid.....	45
The Corporation in our society.....	46
The Internal Yardstick-the corporation as community.....	47
The purpose of business.....	47
Ownership in industry.....	48
The External Yardstick free enterprise.....	49
IX. THE FORMATION OF POLITICAL OPINION.....	52
Needs and their representatives.....	52
The searching out of needs.....	52
The evaluation of needs.....	53
The harmonizing of needs.....	55
X. THE FORMATION OF A CHRISTIAN PARTY.....	56
Arguments in favour of Christian party formation.....	57
A conditional yes.....	58
Afterword: Face to Face with an Island of Hope.....	59
Select Reading List.....	70

The greatest mistake that we make with our own lives is to **snatch** at the particular objects we desire If we realized the riches that lie within everyone of us we should know that we can all afford to be spendthrift of nine-tenths of the possessions which we treasure; success, praise, and good opinion among men, achievements, and still more material well-being ... Never be afraid of throwing away what you have. If you **can** throw it away it is not really yours. If it is really yours you cannot throw it away. And you may be certain that if you throw it away, whatever in you is greater than you will produce something in its place. Never be afraid of pruning your branches. Trust the future and take risks. In moral, as in economic affairs, the rash man is he who does not speculate (R H Tawney 1912).

To a very special group of ordinary people,
the journalists of Fiji,
in all areas of the mass media,
especially those working in the editorial offices of
The Fiji Times, The Fiji Sun and The Fiji Daily Post,
who have courageously kept to their vocations
and sought under trying circumstances
to maintain the highest standards in reporting
without fear or favour
despite all the serious threats and intimidations
especially since December 2006
and who have thereby kept open the possibility
that Fiji might yet hear a Christian political option
for these troubled times.

I. A NECESSARY RISK¹

This book is about politics. More precisely, it attempts to deal with Christian politics. This subject, because of its vastness and mobility, reminds one of a turbulent ocean or a troubled sea.

To begin with, a multitude of problems confronts us with the mere mention of the word 'politics'. For politics, which can be roughly described as every more or less systematic use of governmental power or influence, is not only practiced on different levels - local, regional, national, supra-national - but is present in many diverse areas such as the social, cultural, economic, etc.

Moreover, there are many different forms of governmental interference. A government can use direct means of force, but also indirect ones. The latter are present, for instance, in budgetary and monetary policy as weapons in the battle against inflation and unemployment. A government can prohibit, but it can also persuade; it can order, but it can also stimulate. Finally, governmental decisions can be made in a variety of ways. They can be made dictatorially or democratically. They can be arrived at by the government alone or in conjunction with, for example, industrial organizations. A political decision can be subject to external pressures. And this by no means exhausts the possibilities. In short, politics is certainly not a placid, well-organized stage presentation. At first glance it looks more like a confused, multi-coloured carnival procession, though of a notably more serious character. It should be apparent that the multi-coloured nature of politics makes every publication on the subject somewhat of a gamble. This risk applies even more to the actual practice of politics. The political arena is so complex and demands knowledge of so many different factors and circumstances, that one can easily "miss the mark" in one's decisions. Political mistakes are frightening because politics decisively influences the lives of millions. Hence politics, whether in word or deed, is always a very risky undertaking.

Christian politics can miss the mark

In this publication, however, we are not just concerned with politics in general but particularly with Christian politics. This puts our theme in double jeopardy!

For we must honestly admit that there have been many attempts to translate and articulate the message of the gospel for political life attempts which were obvious failures. Often conclusions squarely contradicting each other have been drawn from the Bible. Appealing to the Bible, one person would defend the perpetuation of existing authority structures and property relationships while another would propose changes in these relationships. One person would describe colonialism as a Christian national calling in the light of the Bible while another would, on the basis of that same Bible, reject colonialism as anti-Christian. After so much confusion, where do we get the audacity to posit a relationship between politics and gospel? Hasn't it been conclusively shown that the Bible is an insufficient guide for communally conceived Christian political action? These questions become even more serious when we consider that in this area as well failure on our part can have very frightening consequences. In addition to damaging the lives of many citizens, wrong conclusions may also harm the cause of the gospel. When we propagate as Christian a political system which is unjust, we may become guilty of forever estranging people from the gospel. Then we become a

¹ pp. 1-3 in 1972 edition

roadblock between them and Christ with our so-called Christian politics.

These questions aren't rhetorical. if we disregard them because of their potentially serious consequences, we court disaster both for ourselves and others. A so-called 'Christian' politics which proceeds from a matter-of-fact faith or from a feeling of self-satisfaction will most certainly lead to a total fiasco. If that is the case we may indeed go forth with the Bible as Israel did long ago with the ark; but we'll lose both the battle and our link with the gospel.

An unavoidable gamble

Political activity as well as political reflection is thus a serious matter not only for ourselves but also for others. And it becomes even more serious when we try to engage in it from out of a biblical perspective. Aren't these tempting reasons to leave political thinking and acting to others?

This is an understandable reaction. But it doesn't answer the questions of whether we are *capable* of acting and thinking politically, nor the equally important question of whether we can escape doing so. The latter question can only be given a negative answer because no matter how we twist or turn, politics remains one of the constant expressions of daily life. Whether we like it or not, politics concerns all of us. Some as citizens, others as government officials. Politics is *one* of the ways in which we as people depend on and relate to each other. Whether we like it or not, we bear co-responsibility for one another's lot and thus for the structuration of our society. Even if we are not concerned with politics, politics is concerned about us. That is why head-in-the-sand politics is still a very real form of politics - and an extremely bad form at that.

No one can avoid the challenge of responsible political engagement, not withstanding all our past failings and short-sightedness. The challenge of political action based on the gospel remains for the Christian. While we may not superficially rid ourselves of the problems just posed, there is the undeniable fact that the gospel proclaims itself as a Word for the world: as Word that affects and desires to redeem all our cultural activities. Therefore it is simply impossible to be a Christian and to simultaneously deny the relevance of this Christianity to political life. To put it differently: even if we aren't concerned with the gospel in politics the gospel is concerned about our political activities. Christ has redeemed our *total* existence and re-directed it to God.

A dated mission

A tension results between our failure in politics on the one hand, and our task in politics on the other; a tension - an unmistakable tension - that becomes even more severe when we take up this task in the light of the gospel. When we approach our political task more concretely in the following chapters, we may not ignore this tension by attempting to escape to an idealized picture of Christian politics that bears no relationship to the concrete world. Hence we'll begin with an overview - necessarily in very broad terms - of the most important political problems, directions, and conceptions of our age. Chapter II will focus on the most important contemporary political choices; Chapter III will discuss political directions such as socialism, liberalism, communism and pragmatism; Chapter IV will contain comments on political questions in light of the proclamations of the Second Vatican Council and the World Council of Churches. This exploration of the current scene will serve as a backdrop for developing the contours of an effective Christian political program.

The Kingdom is not only beyond our efforts, it is even beyond our vision.
We accomplish in our lifetime only a tiny fraction of the magnificent enterprise that is God's word.
Nothing we do is complete, which is another way of saying that the Kingdom always lies beyond us.
No statement says all that should be said.
No prayer fully expresses our faith.
No conversion brings perfection, no pastoral visit brings wholeness.
No programme accomplishes the church's mission.
No set of goals and objectives includes everything.
This is what we are about.
We plant seeds that one day will grow or maybe die.
We water seeds already planted, knowing that they hold future promise.
We lay foundations that will need further development.
We provide yeast that produces effects far beyond our capabilities.
We cannot do everything and there is a sense of liberation in realizing that.
This enables us to do something and do it very well.
It may be incomplete but it is a beginning.
A step along the way.
An opportunity for God's grace to enter and do the rest.
We may never see the results.
But that is the difference between the master builder and the worker.
We are the workers, not master builders. We are ministers, not messiahs.
We are prophets of a future that is not our own.

Archbishop Oscar Romero, El Salvador (1917-1980)

QUESTIONS FOR GROUP DISCUSSION AND REFLECTION

1. List some of the personal risks that will have to be faced when promoting a Christian political option.
2. What are the spiritual risks of avoiding politics?
3. Why does professor Goudzwaard say that politics can never be religiously neutral?
4. Read the comments of Archbishop Romero and Ratu Sir Penaia Ganilau and reflect upon the sacrifices that are necessary if political freedom is to be maintained.

Almighty God has given us a land of abundance in which to live. He has surrounded us with oceans teeming with life. He has granted us the privilege of living among peoples of many cultures, and sharing in the richness of that diversity. As citizens of Fiji, we are a fortunate people indeed. **Ratu Sir Penaia Ganilau (1918-1993)**

II. CURRENT POLITICAL PROBLEMS²

Any serious political observer is impressed by both the great diversity of developments and their seemingly strong internal regularity and consistency. Politics operate in a specific situation; and it often appears as though these given situations contain the entire series of political decisions which subsequently must or will be taken. The best politician then seems to be the person who has the proper 'feel' of a given situation, who is 'in touch', and who can almost automatically execute the action which the situation *itself* demands.

This view of politics seems to correspond with the facts, and appeals to many in our pragmatistic age. If politics is merely an exercise of filling in the blanks with that which the facts (*pragma* = fact) themselves demand, then any discussion about principles and convictions is redundant nonsense and irrelevant bombast. It is the primary purpose of this chapter to illuminate, with the aid of a series of political problems, that one who holds this viewpoint in politics is being deceived by mere appearance. This illumination is entirely necessary because deception by appearance is a real danger in politics. Political activity dictated by what the situation itself seems to 'demand' amounts to nothing less than an abandonment of our specific political calling. Such a calling isn't a matter of merely following events; it's a matter of shaping these events.

Political determinants

What are some of the political determinants, or defining factors which seemingly dictate, in advance, solutions to just about every political problem? Without striving for completeness, the following appear to be the most important determinants:

Increasing production and income in western nations, and the resulting gulf which is increasing between rich and poor countries.

Increasing population, both nationally and internationally.

Increasing technical knowledge, and in connection with this:

- a. Increasing growth in size and power formation in the economic sphere.
- b. Increasing influence of the means of communication and possibilities of national and international contact, e.g. in the relationship between East and West.
- c. Increasing threat of war.
- d. Increasing education and an accentuated struggle for co-determination and a voice in the decision-making process (for instance, on the part of employees in various business enterprises).

The influence these factors have on many political decisions, especially in the area of socio-economic policy, at first appear to be totally determinative. A few questions may clarify this. Doesn't the increasing population of a country necessarily lead to a space shortage, and hence to a policy directly oriented towards the preservation and

² pp. 5-12 in 1972 edition

maximum use of land? And in the face of an ever increasing national income, isn't it inescapable that we should strive for a further shortening of the work week? And doesn't the advance of modern means of communication and the development of international trade spontaneously lead to a search for supra-national forms of governmental influence and to a decreased significance of national borders? And don't we discover in these same factors why the economic systems on both sides of the iron curtain increasingly resemble each other, despite differences of opinion about economics and politics? And isn't it inescapable that the increased struggle for co-determination will in the long run result in more participation of employees in the shaping of employers' policies? Questions like these can be multiplied.

However, when we subject this kind of approach to a closer scrutiny, we must be especially critical on two counts.

First, when these influences (increasing population, production, knowledge, etc.) are at work, they still in no way give a decisive answer to the way in which one should react to these influences politically. When, for example, the population in a country increases and private space decreases, a policy of land control is indeed inescapable. But more than one direction can be given to this policy, and a conscious human choice between alternatives is necessary. Similar criticism applies to the other questions posed.

More important, however, all the determining factors which we mentioned are a lot less unalterable than they first appear. Or to put it differently: even factors such as increase in production or expanding technical knowledge are dependent upon human, and hence political, will and shaping. Each of these factors contains the necessity of human choice, a choice which involves man's view of himself and the world - a choice, moreover, which always has a political dimension. Closer observation should clarify this.

Increasing national income

It is beyond dispute that real national income - each citizen's buying power in obtaining goods and services has been increasing on a more or less regular basis in most western nations. But it is a prime political choice what rate of increased production is desirable, and in which way the increased national income is used.

With respect to the tempo of increased production the question arises whether one should not settle for a lower increase in production for the sake of preserving a purer environment (air, water, soil). Further, the question may also be posed if it is perhaps not necessary to slow down economic growth at home for the sake of economic growth in developing nations. Finally, one might ask whether a slowdown in the increase of real national expenditures may not be necessary in order to control inflationary tendencies in the economy.

With respect to the utilization of increasing national income, we should not only pose the question as to whether the distribution of incomes is just (for increased income is the fruit of rising production), but we should also face an equally important question: through which channels should increased income flow? Here we find at least five possibilities or combinations of possibilities:³

1. The possibility of increasing private income and spending (the U.S.A. variant).

³ W. W. Rostrow The Stages of Economic Growth: A Non-Communist Manifesto Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1960.

2. The possibility of increasing social welfare benefits and subsidies (the welfare state variant).
3. The possibility of increasing government spending on housing, highways, and education (the public sector variant).
4. The possibility of increasing military spending (the armament variant).
5. The possibility of increasing spending and investment in developing nations (aid to developing countries variant). This way the gap between the poor and rich countries could gradually be reduced.

Of course, a government in a non-totalitarian society does not have complete control over all these options. But that doesn't mean that it isn't repeatedly and inescapably confronted with the question of whether and how to influence rising production and spending. And in this choice a fundamental and underlying view of government, of man, and of society always plays a role, whether this is admitted or not.

Increasing population

At first glance population increase seems to be a factor which presents itself to a government as a fixed fact. Yet even here there is an element of political choice.

1. In giving aid to developing countries it is an important question whether or not one should stimulate or subsidize birth control campaigns. Any answer to this question obviously contains elements of a world view.
2. A noticeable increase in government spending on medical facilities and traffic safety can reduce the mortality rate. How far should this increase be extended?
3. Should the 'pill' be distributed free under the provisions of public health insurance schemes?
4. Even though one is forced to reckon with national growth figures at least to some extent, this does not determine regional population growth rates. To what extent and with what instruments must a government follow a policy of population distribution, especially in the interests of regions which have fallen behind economically?
5. What policy should be followed with respect to emigration, immigration, loss of skilled manpower to other countries, and use of unskilled foreign laborers?

Street Kids in Bangladesh

CSKS (Chinnamul Shishu Kishore Sangstha) is one of only two organisations that work with street children in Dhaka - there are over one million children living on the streets of major cities in Bangladesh. With support from the Methodist Relief Development Fund, CSKS, a Bangladeshi child welfare agency, runs six rehabilitation centres and 'class-rooms under the sky' where these children are invited to learn literacy and numeracy skills. Between 4pm and 6pm the teachers are busy seeking children for the school from the streets and from 6pm to 8pm they gather them together for lessons. The programme also provides training in candle-making and tailoring, help children prepare for independent living when they leave the centres. CSKS is a particularly critical agency because it supports children involved in the sex trade or substance abuse. Here is a brief excerpt from the MRDF President's blog from his recent trip to Dhaka. "As we walked through the flowing water trying to step on hard core rather than sludge down the side of the huge market we saw a couple of children collecting rubbish. This led us to go into the area where they take the full sacks and we met one of the buyers who explained that they recycle the paper, plastic and bottles. The boys earn 30-40 pence for each full bag of rubbish"

Increasing technical knowledge

Political choice accompanies the growth of technical knowledge. It is possible, for example, for a government to emphasize or de-emphasize the growth of technical knowledge. Moreover, the question presents itself whether the direction of study and research is to be determined solely by industry, or whether it is to be partially channelled or wholly assumed by the government itself. Of even greater import is the question of the proper political response to the encroaching automation of the production processes. The opportunity for industrial employment in some industrialized nations - expressed by the number of employed people is already steadily declining, while industrial production is still increasing. How can we compensate for this loss of employment opportunity? Is it perhaps desirable to greatly reduce the number of working hours? And how can we make certain that man can really live as man in the next few decades, and not stand lonely and hostile before an ever-increasing technology? These questions clearly imply political choices and thus exceed the boundaries of purely technical answers. When these questions are asked and answered, a certain view of man emerges. Even in the last third of the twentieth century 'man does not live by bread alone'.

Increasing power formation in economic life

Technological advance undeniably implies an ever larger scale of operation in the economic sector, and hence the formation of larger control and management units. Amalgamation has developed in several branches of the economy, along with the powerful stimulation of demand for the brand name products through advertising and sales promotion. For increasingly expanded industrial producers need to be assured of a stable and growing market to be able to plan future production.⁴ Hence economic power expands in breadth as well as depth: modern corporations are capable of influencing and shaping the consumption patterns of all consumers and all of us too!

Undoubtedly a political system which allows itself to be governed by these developments might well be a very bad form of government. A passive governmental

⁴ . See here especially J. K. Galbraith, *The New Industrial State*. Boston, 1968.

attitude might mean that in the long run the needs and behavior patterns of the citizens become more and more 'commercialized'. This might well lead a society to be oblivious to real needs outside of the marketplace: in western nations to the need for clean air, fresh water, adequate transportation, and a good educational system; and in developing countries to the many real unsatisfied economic needs. Moreover, a passive governmental attitude can easily lead to yet another danger: the spheres of influence of business and government can become so tightly interwoven that it becomes almost impossible for the government to act as anything but an extension of industrial interests in employment problems and related labor issues.

Here again therefore we are confronted with genuine political choices. What position is the government to take with respect to the increasing influence of advertising in society? Should advertising expenditure be curbed, perhaps partially bent in another direction? How should a government interact with employer and employee organizations? Should each amalgamation and every form of economic concentration be allowed to go unchallenged by the government? Should economic policy indeed be directed in such a way that the government accepts more and more direct responsibility for the fate of individual business concerns (which is the tendency e.g. of French economic policy)?

We need not argue that every answer that is given to questions such as these is in the last analysis inspired by an underlying and basic vision regarding the duties and powers of government and industry. For example, those who advocate, with the English economist Crosland, that modern government cannot and may not rule without receiving the prior consent of the major interest groups for its policies, in fact replace the idea of the Just State (German: *Rechtsstaat*) with that of the consensus state in the socio-economic realm. The basis for governmental policy is no longer the impartial promotion of the public interest, but a striving for mutual agreement between the government and private interest groups. And this is a choice which cannot be justified with an appeal to factual development which supposedly demands it. The politician has to make a choice and take complete political responsibility.

Increasing confrontation between East and West

A similar approach can be taken in regard to increasing confrontation between East and West - a confrontation in fact between two distinct social systems. Undoubtedly advancing technology and a resulting expanded scale in economic life are intensifying this confrontation. But this doesn't mean that in the long run the societies of East and West will become basically similar. Whoever assumes this overlooks the fact that such a similarity will be possible only if the West makes a prior political choice, viz. that ultimately the norm of maximal economic growth is decisive in the shaping of society, and that in the confrontation between East and West our major concern is to stay ahead of the Iron Curtain countries in the rate of economic growth. However, if one holds the view that the freedom of enterprise and industrial development has an independent significance apart from their economic results, then one has introduced a norm for shaping a society which may lead to lasting differences with a country directed by the collectivistic spirit. It should be evident that on this basis the confrontation between East and West will be more fundamental than that of a purely economic contest.

Even in the economic confrontation between East and West one cannot escape a political choice.

Increasing threat of war

It is undoubtedly true that there are many factors which heighten the threat of war. Besides modern armament technology, we could mention present racial tensions, the spreading of nuclear arms across the globe, the prosperity gap between rich and poor countries, the presence of a militant China and the great military power blocks.

It would be a mistake, however, to assume that these factors by themselves make the coming of a new world war inevitable. The waging of war is always a human decision, a conscious political act for which one remains fully responsible under all circumstances.

Moreover, the element of political choice is present in the ways men try to neutralize or remove the factors and influences which might lead to war. Should a new world-wide legal order be promoted? If our answer is affirmative, how can this be accomplished? Should NATO change its basic character; and if so, how? Should aid to developing countries be channelled through existing indigenous regimes? And how can further proliferation of nuclear weapons be prevented?

Besides all these questions there are problems of an even more profound nature, which are intimately related to the view one holds concerning the problem of war itself. Such a view can never be said to be inspired only by the facts. Some problems here are: whether one may ever be the first to resort to arms in case of a conflict; whether one is justified in using nuclear weapons defensively against a nuclear attack; and whether there is a connection - and if so, of what nature - between warmongering, apostasy, and spiritual disintegration in a given society.

The element of an independent and personal political judgment is always present in attitudes toward individual wars (compare for example the conflict in Viet Nam with the one concerning Israel).

In some cases, for example, in the Arab-Israeli conflict, a specific view of life can also play a role; in this case the view that the people and the land of Israel were joined together by God's own hand in days of long ago.

Concluding remarks

I've placed the emphasis quite strongly on the problems of socio-economic policy because socio-economic policy seems largely to be determined and developed by a great number of given, external factors. Hopefully it has been demonstrated that in this sector of socio-economic policy, extremely important political choices present themselves - especially today - which cannot and may not be ignored.

And if this is true for an area seemingly as pre-determined as the socio-economic realm, then obviously it holds to an even greater degree for the non-socio-economic elements of governmental policy.

For in these other areas there are many more political directions. For example: in important aspects of foreign affairs, in policies concerning art and culture, in policies concerning the physical and spiritual health of the populace.

QUESTIONS FOR GROUP DISCUSSION AND REFLECTION

1. Read the first question and answer in Professor Goudzwaard's interview, p. 73. Think about the changes that have occurred over this same period since Fiji gained independence in 1970. List some of the important differences that Fiji has experienced since that time and which you would add to the discussion if you were re-writing this chapter.
2. List some (e.g. 12) of Fiji's major political problems. Which of these are unique to Fiji? Why? Which problems does Fiji share with the island states of the region, and which with Australia and New Zealand? Why?
3. Which countries are Fiji's special friends? Why?

*When the Christian community is
split, is Christ Himself divided?*
Dietrich Bonhoeffer

**Father, whate'er of earthly bliss
Thy sov'reign will denies,
Accepted at Thy throne let this
My humble prayer arise.**

**Give me a calm, a thankful heart,
From every murmur free;
The blessing of Thy grace impart,
And let me live to Thee.**

**Let the sweet hope that Thou art mine
My life and death attend,
Thy presence through my journey shine,
And crown my journey's end.**

Anne Steele 1716-1778 One of the most gifted women hymn writers of the 18th century, Anne Steele's life was filled with tragedy. Her mother died when she was three and at 19 she became an invalid. On the marriage of her wedding her fiancé was drowned. At 44, her collected verse was published and this is one of those seeking strength to be thankful despite her lot

For most of us it costs nothing to preach, to speak about our Christian beliefs, to attend church services, or to say, "I'm a Christian." But there's another element to our Christianity. We need to ask ourselves, "What have I actually done that proves my loyalty to Christ? How many times have I sacrificed my own well-being for that of others, in the name of Christ - this week, this month, or even during the last five years?" President Jimmy Carter "The Cost of Grace" (sermon)

III. MOVEMENTS OF OUR TIMES⁵

To properly appreciate the tasks and possibilities of Christian political action requires a basic knowledge of the political conceptions of our time. Now I'll briefly give a rough sketch of some of these.

Today's socialism

Today's socialism is clearly distinguishable from that of before the second world war; and development did not exactly come to a halt after the war either. Therefore only a snapshot impression is possible. Today's socialism basically shares these conceptions with its earlier predecessor:

- It views the interest of individual men to be largely an extension of the interests of the national community, and hence puts the most emphasis on these latter interests.
- It desires to give context to individual civil rights especially through accentuating the economic prospects and possibilities opened up for each person by the national community.

Besides this, one could point to a stress on the interests of the employees, and to the ready acceptance of ordering and planning techniques by administrative bodies of the national government for the sake of improving the society of the future, a society which is structured in harmony with the major themes just mentioned.

These major themes of socialism also come to expression in the way concepts and ideas are used. Freedom for socialism is primarily a freedom from coercive economic situations (such as poverty, unemployment), and is to be brought about by the (national) community. When socialism speaks of justice it means above all a socio-economic justice (equal economic opportunities), which should be brought about via the community. Other ideas and concepts, such as responsibility, equality, 'public interest', etc., are provided with similar accents by socialism. In all this an original element of the Marxist-socialist faith, though considerably watered down, is still expressed, namely, that for the community as a whole actual salvation and real happiness will dawn through the economic reshaping of society. For Marx this meant the nationalization of all private means of production.

Of this original tenet today's socialism often retains only very weak remnants, which come to expression in the above mentioned 'themes'. Moreover, we could characterize the specific development within socialism as a movement from dogmatism to opportunism. This comes to expression in two ways:

- The accents on 'community' and 'economics' are becoming less pronounced. Present day socialism increasingly concedes a position of independence to the individual person and his civil rights within the community.
- Socialism has become very flexible concerning the concrete paths which are to be travelled in order to arrive at a better society. It has become a matter of secondary importance to the socialist whether one must take the road of

⁵ pp. 13-19 in 1972 edition

socialization, or that of direct interference and regulation of existing structures of authority, or that of exercising influence through comprehensive intervention at strategic points, or perhaps that of monetary control.

It is noteworthy, however, that throughout the western world new progressive movements within socialism have again put a stronger emphasis on certain concrete directions (e.g. nationalization), and hence have started to view the manner of intervention as less secondary. This is a reaction against the present opportunistic and even bourgeois tendencies in the older socialist movements and undoubtedly expresses the current emphasis on 'clarity' in politics.⁶

Today's libertarianism

Liberalism and socialism originally were at opposite poles. Today's liberalism is but a pale shadow of yesterday's. The traditional themes of liberalism were:

1. A strong emphasis on the worth of the individual (not the community).
2. A strong emphasis on the maintenance of formal civil rights (property rights, freedom of contract, free enterprise, freedom of employment, freedom of consumption).

These themes are still noticeable today, especially in North America, where the tenets of classical liberalism are at times given a new name: libertarianism. To the real liberal, freedom is above all the freedom of the individual to exercise his own rights without hindrance. Justice then means that each individual is granted the unobstructed utilization of his rights. The liberal tends to apply these themes to all political concepts and ideas. Concepts such as freedom, equality, justice, responsibility, and so on, are of course nothing but empty cartridges which always derive their content from an external source, i.e., from an underlying commitment to a world view.

At their deepest level these themes of liberalism are anchored in a conscious commitment to a humanist faith. Classical liberalism believed unconditionally in the right of 'man as individual' to be a law unto himself, just as traditional socialism asserted this concerning 'man in community'. The old liberalism was rooted in the belief that an ideal society would flourish spontaneously if only government would restrict itself to guaranteeing each individual his 'rights'. To this faith the old liberal clung with heart and soul.

The weakening of dogma, however, has permeated liberalism perhaps even more than it did socialism, notably in western Europe. Today's liberals plead for a 'just' mean between the interests of the individual and those of society. Consequently they can go in almost any direction, with a frequent appeal to reason and common sense. They often are opportunist in practice, although the old themes come strongly to the fore every now and then, especially in times of crisis. The liberals still present opposition to socialism most clearly in the capital-labor issue. From the very start socialism made the interests of labor its first concern, while liberalism still stresses the interests of capital. The difference between socialism and liberalism came out quite clearly in the Netherlands a few years ago, when the universal issue of advertising on television had to be decided upon. While the liberal party clearly favored subjecting television programs to 'commercializing' influence by means of advertising, the socialist party

⁶ The "Waffle Wing" of the socialist New Democratic Party in Canada is an example..

opposed this trend. We noted above that in the socialist camp there is a new swing to the original tenets of radical socialism. A similar phenomenon can be detected in the liberal camp. While in a number of countries the basic tenets of classical liberalism are hardly adhered to in a dogmatic manner and in the United States the very term 'liberal' is rejected by those who most tenaciously defend these tenets. In recent years there is a distinct revival on this side of the political spectrum which often goes under the name of Neo-liberalism. Proponents of this revival can be found especially in Germany and the United States where the writings of Ludwig von Mises, Wilhelm Röpke, F.A. Hayek, and Milton Friedman continue to be popular in certain circles. Neo-liberalism can briefly be described as that movement which demands a deep respect for the exercise of free economic competition. The government must respect this competition and encourage it as much as possible. When the results of this free competition lead to socially unacceptable consequences, the government may not for this reason interfere in the free market process. Instead, it must then pursue a social policy that does not affect this process.⁷

Today's communism

Today's communism is also very different from that of earlier years. This is as true of national communism (Russia, Italy, Yugoslavia) as it is of international communism, including China. The most important points of difference are:

Communism today (following Lenin) puts much more stress on the influence of man's own action in the development of society. Marx was of the opinion that this influence is extremely limited. For him it was not man but the law of nature which governed societal development in a dialectical way.

Today's communism views the laboring masses not as a single whole, but distinguishes between those who have arrived at revolutionary self-consciousness (the party) and the rest of the laboring masses.

Today's communism no longer views revolution as the only possible way to build a different society. A capitalistic society can change into a communistic one by way of a democratic majority in the western parliaments. For emerging nations, however, 'revolution' is still held to be the best method, which is to be preceded by 'national wars of liberation'.

In opposition to Marx, communism accepts the continuing existence of a powerful state as the intermediate phase between a socialistic and a completely communistic society. Russia hopes to arrive at the latter around 1980.

Today's communism no longer has a completely closed world view in which all sciences have to be based on the communistic system. According to contemporary communist doctrine, linguistics and formal logic have been set free from the demands of the class struggle.

Today's communism accepts certain 'capitalistic' elements in the economic sphere, such as a limited striving for profit in industry, a certain measure of free price formation, and a very limited private ownership of agricultural land.

Communism deems the transition from capitalism to communism also possible

⁷ In the United States, The Foundation for Economic Education plays a significant role in popularising the tenets of Neo-liberalism through its monthly publication, [The Freeman: Ideas on Liberty](#).

in principle in non-industrialized societies (in contradistinction to Marx). Chinese communism, however, carries this notion much further than its Russian counterpart.

Lenin launched the dogma of 'peaceful co-existence' between the socialistic and non-socialistic peoples (not: states!). There exists several important differences between Russian and Chinese communism in the interpretation of this dogma. Chinese communism stays closer to Lenin's original - certainly not 'pacifist' - intention.

All these changes and shifts constantly evolve, especially in Russian communism. Hence, observers expect that communism will continue to free itself more and more of dogmatic elements.

Of course these developments may not tempt us to think that communism is a bankrupt affair and a 'faith' which never found acceptance among the great masses of people. These misconceptions are fueled by propaganda in the western countries. For the majority of the Russian and Chinese population, communism is a living faith. The educational and communication systems take care that this majority retains its confidence in communism. The developments in the West, especially in the economic, social and spiritual areas, are carefully followed, for the heartfelt conviction still exists that the capitalistic system will someday completely collapse and the West will also accept communism. It would be foolish on our part to accept the assumption that this expectation can never come true.

Pragmatism

Pragmatism is on the increase, everywhere, both within existing political parties and through the formation of new ones. Perhaps most countries in the West will grow towards a party system such as the one found in the U.S. There we find two large parties facing each other (Republicans and Democrats) which are both strongly pragmatic in orientation. What is pragmatism?

a. In its most simple sense, 'pragmatism' indicates a movement which desires to be led by facts (*pragma* = fact) alone, without the so-called 'bias' of specific convictions or principles. Purely on the grounds of a healthy and businesslike weighing of facts one attempts to arrive at a political position.

b. On a somewhat deeper level the word 'pragmatism' is used to indicate that movement in western thought which denies that there is one norm for truth which binds all people. Only that can be 'true' and 'correct' which is useful for the factual, practical goals which one has established. If a certain pronouncement or measure brings you closer to this practical goal, that pronouncement or measure is true and correct. For example, the American philosopher William James, the founder of pragmatic philosophy, was of the opinion that it is true that God exists, not because he 'believed' this, but because he found that people who believed in God felt more secure in life. Religion proves to be useful, and therefore is true.

This second form of pragmatism has deeply penetrated the academic disciplines today. In many contemporary scientific publications the opinion is advanced, for example, that scientific definitions do not have to be 'objectively' true in the old-fashioned sense of the word. The only demand one can make of a definition is that it be

'workable' that it be 'useful' in the development of scientific research.

In the broader areas of western culture, pragmatism as an attitude towards life is in full advance. The question whether a certain action is morally or ethically correct is asked less and less, and more and more people are only interested in what the practical effect of an action will be. If there is a desired effect, then an action causing it is declared to have been the correct action.

Up till now political pragmatism has presented itself in western Europe in the first, simpler form: an increasing number of politicians claim to be led by the facts alone. Closely connected with this is today's great emphasis on concrete points in political platforms; *how* the program itself is arrived at is held to be of little significance. Only concrete points on the program count; only they contribute to 'political clarity'. The clarity is not desirable that uncovers underlying motives; only that clarity is allowed which gives practical, factual results.

It's not enough to have political parties give lip service to norms and principles for action; when the only real yardstick of political action or movements is reduced to practical results, the heart has been cut out of political choice and responsibility.

The 'simple' form of pragmatism - taking its point of departure from 'facts' alone - is essentially untenable, as has already been shown above. For there is always the necessity of making political choices: in so-called 'factual' judgments and assessments we find that certain insights and motives always play a role, whether this is wanted or not, or whether one is conscious of it or not. Therefore the 'simple' form of pragmatism is inconsistent. Honesty *and* clarity demand that underlying motives be brought to light. And in the long run they do come to light. Then the 'simple' pragmatist has little choice: *either* he comes across with the honest admission that he also has firmly fixed motives and opinions, or he chooses his principles and motives to suit his practical actions. In the latter case his naive pragmatism - taking only the facts into account - has grown into a consistent and complete pragmatic view of life.

Hence in the future any party should have to explain positions taken in its election platform. Take for example the pronouncement that it is desirable to maintain a 'reasonable balance between social justice and economic efficiency' when the distribution of income and wealth are considered. What is meant here by 'social justice'? Nearly every political party - conservative, liberal, socialist - is willing to refer to the concept of 'social justice' and others like it in its programs and platforms. But the point that must be stressed here - for the sake of necessary political clarity and credibility - is that a concept like 'social justice' can receive meaning and content only in terms of a basic and underlying view of man and society. If a political party doesn't provide clarity at this level, it will hardly be credible in executing its concrete political program, since it will tend to shift arbitrarily and according to the needs of practical expediency from a liberal (libertarian) to a middle-of-the-road to a more socialistic motivation; on the other hand, pragmatic politics puts the cart before the horse: principles and underlying motivations are relied upon mainly for the convenience of getting a practical political program accepted.

It need not be elaborated here that consistent pragmatism is the fruit of a disintegrated humanism which has reasoned out of existence all norms and principles which might be binding on people. It seems liberating, but in fact one is subjected to the terrorism of practical goals, which at first are simply proposed but then canonized. These goals have then in effect become the 'new principles' for political and social action.

QUESTIONS FOR GROUP DISCUSSION AND REFLECTION

1. Is communism a viable political option for Fiji and the South West pacific island states?
2. Nominate one or two of your group to do some research on the impact of the People's Republic of China and Taiwan on the region and to report back with their findings to your next meeting.
3. How would you describe the political movements that are present in Fiji as represented by the major political parties - SDL, NFP, FLP ... ? Do they correspond to similar parties in the region - Tonga, Solomons, PNG, Vanuatu ... - or with New Zealand and Australia?
4. How should the major political parties respond to and respect the views of indigenous political movements (Taukei, Kudra na Vanua ...)
5. Can you identify some basic differences between Fijian politics and politics as that is played out in New Zealand and Australia?
6. What about the rise of militarism world-wide? Does Fiji fit in with a world-trend (e.g. Africa - Zimbabwe, Asia - Thailand, Burma)? If so where are the connections with the wider global scene? Or is "coup culture" a peculiarly and exclusively Fijian local problem for Fiji to fix? Why?

... I am still discovering right up to this moment, that it is only by living completely in this world, that one learns to have faith. By this worldliness I mean living unreservedly in life's duties, problems, successes and failures. In so doing we throw ourselves completely into the arms of God, taking seriously not our own sufferings, but those of the world. That I think is faith ... **Dietrich Bonhoeffer 21 July 1944**

IV. CONTEMPORARY CHRISTIAN SOCIAL REFLECTION⁸

For the delineation of our own conception concerning Christian social reflection and action, it is important to pay some attention to developments in other Christian circles. Here we have in mind the on-going reflection within the World Council of Churches and the Roman Catholic Church, especially the pronouncements of the Second Vatican Council.

World Council of Churches

Concern by the World Council of Churches regarding the attitude of the Christian towards modern society goes back a long time. The concept of a 'responsible society' was already launched in 1948. The main thrust of this idea was that society should be founded on the liberty of people who perceive themselves to be responsible for justice and public order, and that those who possess political or economic authority in society are accountable to God and to the people whose welfare depends on their authority.

It must be pointed out that this idea of a 'responsible society' was not launched by the World Council of Churches as an idea to be agreed upon by Christians alone. It was intended as an idea which Christians and non-Christians could unite around.

We recognize in the background a strong Lutheran influence on the original thought climate of the Council. According to the two realm conception of Luther, the Christian is a citizen of two kingdoms: that of this world, and that of the kingdom of heaven. He shares his earthly citizenship with non-Christians; the same divine laws hold for Christian and non-Christian, and they can be understood and honoured equally by both. Thus the idea of a 'responsible society' is not thought to be specifically a Christian idea, but the formulation of a societal law around which all well-meaning people, regardless of their faith, can unite.

Reflection within World Council circles has not ceased, of course, since 1948. Following up the idea of a responsible society, much attention has been given in recent years to the necessity of social revolution. With this is meant not so much a seizure of political power, if necessary by violent means, but rather an imperative to rebuild the structure of society.

This kind of thinking has grown out of two main sources. The first of these is the existing situation in many South American countries. There bitter poverty goes hand in hand with the amassing of riches by the few - a disparity which is promoted by the large feudal estates that are still part of the life of Latin America. Many Christian democratic parties in South America correctly view a turnabout of present social structures as the only possibility for arriving at just relationships of income, property and power.

The second source is the situation of Christians behind the Iron Curtain. These Christians experience an immediate confrontation with communism, a system which has made a caricature of the Christian faith by representing it as the invention of capitalism. (Just in passing: this is a caricature for which 'official' Christianity in these countries has often given cause in the past, and continues to do so at times.) According to communism, capitalism utilizes the Christian faith as an ideology; that is to say: it uses

⁸ pp. 21-24 in 1972 edition

Christianity as an instrument to draw the attention of the labouring classes and of the suppressed peoples away from their own situation of exploitation, by holding before their eyes a blessed future life in heaven (Cf. Marx's concept of religion as the 'opiate of the masses'). Christians behind the Iron Curtain correctly view it as their first task to break through this caricature of the Christian faith. And that's possible by making clear to the communists, with word and deed, that the Christian is genuinely able and willing to oppose the presence of injustice and warmongering in *this* world.

Hence especially these Christians behind the Iron Curtain stress the desirability of Christian reflection on the idea of revolution, of the lawful overturning of diseased and unjust social structures.⁹

The Second Vatican Council

The results of the Second Vatican Council in the area of reflection upon socio-economic and political problems are not as yet entirely clear. However, two approaches can be distinguished.

In the first place, more than ever before in Roman Catholic circles the council has given expression to the realization that the gospel has a significance far beyond typical ecclesiastical and religious affairs. The gospel is also a word for the world. It speaks to human society. Paragraph 13 of the Conciliar Statements indicates this clearly.

The second approach, also expressed in paragraph 13, concerns the notion of the 'autonomy' or independence of the realm of temporal and secular matters. This secular or temporal realm is subject to its own laws which to a certain extent can also function outside of the gospel. An example of such 'autonomous' laws is rational insight, often referred to in popular parlance as common sense. The world of politics belongs to this autonomous realm. For this reason Christians and non-Christians can quite readily join hands in the world of politics, either by belonging to one political party or by engaging in common political action.

There is a certain tension between these two approaches. The second one is an obvious and systematic consequence of the classical nature-grace motive which has dominated Roman Catholic reflection about man and society since the middle ages. We would express the hope that the first approach will gradually receive greater attention and become dominant in the long run.

The development which can be noted in recent papal encyclicals is probably even more significant. [Mater et magistra](#), [Pacem in terris](#), [Populorum progressio](#) (which focuses on world poverty) can indeed be interpreted as an attempt to render the traditional static natural law concepts of Roman Catholic philosophy more *dynamic*, to make these concepts more relevant in an ever-changing social situation.

An example may clarify this. In traditional Roman Catholic thought the state has generally been viewed as the 'natural' head of society and as the protector of the public interest. In many instances this 'public interest', to be implemented by the state, was viewed as the sum or synthesis of the existing partial interests of the various groups in

⁹ See the following World Council of Churches publications: John C Bennett [Christian Social Ethics in a Changing World: An Ecumenical Theological Inquiry](#) (1966) (Church and Society Series, No. 1), London, SCM, 1966; Norman Goodall (ed), [The Uppsala Report 1968: Official Report of the Fourth Assembly of the World Council of Churches](#), Uppsala, 1968, Geneva: WCC, 1968.

the nation. In practice, therefore, the politics of Roman Catholics often implied the protection of group interests in the determination of public policy. The content of public interest then amounts to a 'reconciliation' of the 'irreconcilable' partial interests. This approach can readily lead to middle-of-the-road politics. The tendency of the recent papal encyclicals, however, seems to break through all this because the traditional natural law notions are placed in an entirely new and dynamic setting. The most recent argument goes like this: the state must not primarily *protect*, but also dynamically *promote* the public interest; therefore some kind of world government is inevitably demanded for the future.

A similar change is apparent in the area of property rights. Traditionally, all existing property rights were defended as founded in 'nature', thus deserving universal recognition. Now the notion is defended that the universal right of individual property should be shared by all men of *all* races.

Thus the ancient Roman Catholic conception of natural law is used today as the basis and justification for a very progressive endeavor striving after global federalism, aid to developing nations and new property relations.

QUESTIONS FOR GROUP DISCUSSION AND REFLECTION

1. In August 2001 fifty-one churches, ecumenical and civil society organisations, from twenty-nine countries met in Nadi at a Global Conference on Economic Globalization. "Island of Hope - the Pacific Churches response to Economic Globalization".is found at: <http://www.oikoumene.org/fileadmin/files/wcc-main/documents/p3/dossier-7.pdf> . Summarise its major points in one page.
2. Has "Island of Hope" become part of Fijian Christian consciousness? Where can its impact be seen? Why is its impact not more evident? What has happened?
3. Obtain the major political party platforms from the 2006 election and assess them in terms of the teaching that can be found in "Island of Hope" as well as the WCC and Second Vatican Council teaching that is explained in this chapter.
4. How do the churches encourage a Christian political option? What are some of the problems?

We ask the churches to help their members to rediscover the traditional Christian virtue of self-restraint and asceticism [simplicity of life-style], and to propagate these values in their societies as a way of counteracting individualism and consumerism, and as an alternative foundation for economic and social development. **The Island of Hope Dossier 7 p.27.**

It is so easy to be sucked in by the structures, and to be sucked into a false kind of loyalty ending up maybe with a false church. When God grabs you by the scruff of the neck, then although theoretically you have a freedom to say "No!", in another sense actually you can't say "No!" because its like Jeremiah and you find yourself saying, "God you have cheated me! You called me to be a prophet against the people that I love and all that I proclaim is words of doom and judgment and yet if I say I will shut up I can't." **Archbishop Desmond Tutu**

V. THE UNIQUE RADICALITY OF THE GOSPEL¹⁰

The summations contained in the previous chapters of the most important contemporary political problems and currents have undoubtedly been rather incomplete. But in spite of incompleteness, the problems raised so far are already bewildering enough! We must not only take note of the present rapids in several social, technical, economical, cultural and philosophical streams, but also remember that a number of political choices and challenges are involved in navigating these rapids. The political action we advocate today will have inestimable consequences for the world of tomorrow. Political irresponsibility today means that we will face irreparable damage tomorrow.

This implies, however, that the tension between the imperative undertaking and the historical 'failing' in politics, as described in Chapter I, now reaches an almost unbearable intensity. It almost seems that evangelical political action can no longer provide responsible answers for all the challenges of today. Its answers apparently sufficed in an era in which the political scene could be reasonably surveyed, and in which questions such as the direction of education were primary. So now more than ever those who desire to consciously maintain the tie between the gospel and the practical political problems of the moment seem to run the risk of secularizing the gospel instead of performing a genuine service for political life.

Today those who see things this way really seem to be right. But among those who have learned to accept the gospel as a universal, abiding and up-to-date word for the world - not just for a personal 'salvation'! - there is resistance against this 'vision'; and correctly so. Could it be true that the gospel's sphere of influence decreases in direct proportion to the progress of human history? Then time would be mightier than the gospel; then the gospel would have to capitulate to history, and that is an unacceptable position. On the other hand, one has to concede that by merely rejecting this position the problems have in no way disappeared; in fact, they seem to have become more insoluble than before. For it is a *fact* that Christians have often failed in applying the gospel to politics - and it is also a *fact* that this failure can really only become more acute as political problems become complex and obtuse. Those who keep striving under these circumstances for a connection between gospel and politics seem moreover to take a burden upon themselves which has little of the joy of the gospel. For gospel means: glad tidings! How is it possible to escape this dilemma? If evangelical political action can exist, it should at the very best contain some of the joy of the gospel-but that joy seems so very far away.

With this observation a final judgment seems to have been pronounced upon any possible contemporary evangelical political activity. Yet this is not so. Rather, in the above judgment, sentence has been passed only upon the manner in which we ourselves tend to set and have set the problematics of evangelical politics in the past. Why is it that undertaking of evangelical political action seems often to be such a heavy and joyless business? Because in the usual approach Christian political action is preoccupied - though unintentionally - with what we Christians ourselves should do and could do. But a truly Christian politics stands under the banner of what the gospel does. For the Word of God is not a dead letter, but a living Spirit! Therefore, only politics which returns to what the gospel itself works in our hearts and in society can take the pressure off us.

¹⁰ pp. 25-30 in 1972 edition. Goudzwaard was here contributing to a discussion within the *Anti-Revolutionary Party* concerning its Christian basis and founding vision.

To put it differently: political activity in which we see it as our task to bridge the 'gap' between the gospel and politics, has little to do with real Christian politics. Such political activity usually remains frozen in the depressive stage of doctrinal-legalistic politics and never reaches the 'light burden' stage of an evangelical politics - a politics in which there is indeed no trace whatever of the gospel's capitulation to history.

Behold the servant of the Lord!
I wait Thy guiding eye to feel,
To hear and keep Thy every word,
To prove and do Thy perfect will,
Joyful from my own works to cease,
Glad to fulfill all righteousness.

Me, if Thy grace vouchsafe to use,
Meanest of all Thy creatures, me,
The deed, the time, the manner choose,
Let all my fruit be found in Thee;
Let all my works in Thee be wrought
By Thee to full perfection brought.

My every weak, though good design,
O'er rule, or change, as seems Thee meet,
Jesus, let all my work be Thine!
Thy work, O Lord, is all complete,
And pleasing in Thy Father's sight;
Though only hast done all things right.

Here then to Thee Thy own I leave;
Mould as Thou wilt Thy passive clay;
But let me all Thy stamp receive,
But let me all Thy words obey,
Serve with a single heart and eye,
And to Thy glory live and die.

Charles Wesley

Derived principles

Before clarifying that last point, it would be well to point out that recognizing the gospel's own presence and living activity in the political sphere is not as easy as it might appear to many people. In fact it appears that many of the difficulties which Christians have experienced in biblical political reflection spring from an underestimation of this active role of the word of God. How often have people not tortured themselves to bridge the 'gap' between an ancient Bible and a complex of contemporary political realities! Some have attempted to build bridges by means of eternal principles and derived principles; but hardly had a 'derived' principle been constructed (free trade, rugged individualism, rejection of all birth control) before one had to break one's own principle in certain respects. More than this, the radius of activity of these principles turned out to be so limited that whole areas of political life were not touched by them at all - and hence these areas were relegated to bleak neutrality. In these political areas one often had to make do with the motto: relying on common sense.

This weak spot in evangelical political reflection was thoroughly exposed,

especially from the vantage point of Christian liberalism (libertarianism). With justice these people could say: "You acknowledge that politics has become more 'secular' - to the extent that it is possible to directly apply the Bible only in certain areas. Then why don't you join a political party which will share your point of view on these secular problems? The other problems you could easily solve within, for example, an evangelical Christian 'work community' within the party." This was a reaction to which the fundamentalistic adherents of 'derived biblical principles' had, in fact, insufficient reply. All the more when one by one their 'derived principles', as all human ordinances, had to bite the dust under the pressure of changing circumstances. Only primarily evangelical notions, such as the value of Christian education or the realization that government had to be for the benefit of the people, remained.

The gospel as power

As indicated, there has been pain and difficulty in the past. Without judging deepest intentions and motives, one may still regret that many have had - and do have - too little eye for the work of the gospel itself. For was it not-and is it not typical of the approach of many Christians that they saw-and still see-the Bible as a book which can become of significance for politics only through their labour, thanks to their derivations and applications? And is it not this use of the Bible which creates the short-circuits with the concrete political problems of past and present?

The gospel, however, does not present itself as a passive dead book. The gospel speaks of itself in loaded terms: it is a power of God unto salvation, it is the sword of the Spirit which penetrates not only our political activities, but to the very heart of every man.

Therefore the basis of our Christian politics can never be our use of the gospel. Rather, it is the other way around: Christian evangelical politics comes into being when we let ourselves be used by the gospel.¹¹ Evangelical politics does not rest on our active reaching out to God's Word, but on the active reaching out of God's Word to us and to the whole world.

In this there is liberation - the joy of Christian politics. We don't really have to make sure anymore that the Bible will become significant in politics, for it has had that significance for a long time through the power of the Spirit of God everywhere in the world where the gospel has been proclaimed. And we don't have to supply the basis, the 'raison d'être' of Christian politics anymore. For it is also anchored in the working of the gospel itself. In politics the Word of God *itself* desires to make us mindful of what is evil, of what we should or what we shouldn't do.

Therefore in forming our political opinions we can rely on the gospel-even in the most difficult political problems. For it embraces no less than the whole world and does not even stop at the portals of our own hearts. It is present from the outset in every political situation.

All this does not mean, of course, that there is no such thing as failure in politics. But it does mean that our failures now stand in a different light. Even though we don't have to be afraid that the power of the gospel will desert us in our political activities - it is very well possible that we have deserted the gospel in many political decisions. This could happen, for example, when we prevent the power of the gospel from penetrating

¹¹ Editor's note: see the quote from Herman Dooyeweerd at the conclusion to this chapter..

the ideas and concepts out of which we fashion political decisions. It also happens when we close our eyes to the ever-present choice with which the gospel confronts us and the world.

We will probably never completely escape failures of this kind. But at the same time it is true that we may never cite failure as an excuse. This is also the reason why in Chapter I we said without hesitation that in the tension between our failure and our task the latter has to triumph. For we can never hide behind this kind of failure in order to ignore our calling. We could, in a manner of speaking, no more easily stop our striving after Christian politics than we could stop being Christians.

Program

Something of a program emerges in the position which we chose a minute ago. We will develop this program in the following chapters because we must gradually choose concrete political positions. We must, however, at all costs avoid building towering Christian constructions on the basis of the odd Bible text. Then we would usurp the place of the gospel again, perhaps without even noticing it. The only right way to go about it would appear to be this: attempt to illustrate how the gospel itself, as a dynamic power, acts upon our own forming of political opinion, and upon the world around us. And so, Christian politics comes into its own when we open ourselves up to the power of the gospel. It is not an artificial inflation of our own egos with the aid of a set of a-political, edifying niceties, but a spontaneous following of the gospel as it continually confronts us and others with a decisive choice in the midst of contemporary political problems: a choice between life and death, between hope and despair, between light and darkness.

This choice first touches us. In politics we shall have to choose between our self-chosen ideas and concepts and the 'charge', the content, which the gospel gives them. The gospel breaks right through our middle class ideas and thought patterns. What this should mean in politics will be the subject of the next chapter.

This choice also touches our relationship to our fellowmen. On this level the gospel is active as a message of peace, and as an answer to all forms of demonic power (Chapter VII).

Finally, this choice also touches the society we build as human beings. As much as we ourselves, the structures of society need to be submitted to the critical examination of the powerful word of God; for they are in their given forms a product of our (dirty) hands. If we protect society from this critical power of the gospel, we have in fact made it an idol. Therefore, on the level of the structuration of society, the gospel places a choice before us of what is and what ought to be (Chapter VIII).

A summary of the total working of the Word of God in politics is that it urges us to strive after a politics conceived in the radicality of the gospel. This gospel radicality is directed both at our hearts - breaking radically through our middle class ideas, concepts and motives - and at the society around us, whose very basis and root (*radix*) are subject to the testing power of that same gospel.

Before we start with this program, however, there is still a need for two introductory remarks. It is extremely revealing that the choice which the gospel demands of everyone in politics does not only confront non-Christians but also Christians. This is revealing because we are usually inclined to view ourselves in politics as the carriers of

the gospel, who confront others with it, but who remain out of range ourselves for the most part. But all of us are confronted ever anew by the choice of the gospel. Christians are just as prone to choose evil as anyone else or as any other political movement. Hence a Christian political party never excels other parties simply by definition.

A second remark. The approach which we shall try to take - and it remains to be tried - excludes the giving of political recipes. What has to be done concretely in each political situation remains a question of personal responsibility for the Christian politician. The intent of this book is in fact no more - and should in our opinion be no less - than to aid others in their own, gospel-directed formation of contemporary political judgment.

This does not mean, however, that the significance of the gospel for politics would be reproduced sufficiently with the use of terms such as: Christianly inspired politics, or evangelically sensitive politics. The most important objection to this sort of thing is that it re-channels and narrows the significance of the gospel for politics to a purely subjective level, making it that which the Christian feels he can pick up for himself in the gospel. The objection grows even stronger when one's 'being inspired' is viewed as something which others have to accept as an unexplained given; when for others the content would already by definition be lifted above any kind of evangelical reflection and testing.

"Those who believe that truly scriptural principles for the state can be obtained solely from explicit Bible texts, base their beliefs on a completely wrong view of scripture. They merely see words, but forget that God's Word is Spirit and Power, and that this Word has to bear upon all of life. God's Word-revelation puts you to work. It wants to influence your whole existence, it wants to bring new life where death and spiritual laziness rule. You who'd like to take it easy hope the ripe fruits of God's Word-revelation will be given to you without any efforts on your part. But Christ Jesus tells you that you yourself have to bear fruit when the seed of God's Word has fallen in fertile soil". Herman Dooyeweerd Roots of Western Culture: Pagan, Secular and Christian Options Wedge 1979, . 58-59

QUESTIONS FOR GROUP DISCUSSION AND REFLECTION

1. Christian political action and reflection does not aim to secure rights for Christians that are not guaranteed to all other citizens, religious, non-religious and anti-religious. Discuss.
2. "Candidates in an election will show they are fit for public office not only by the way they help voters decide between policy platforms, but by the way they show that they truly understand and appreciate the views of their political opponents." Is such an approach to an election possible in Fiji? Why? Why not?
3. Politics is about conflicting argument about political direction. Comment on the implications of this both before and after, an election.

In 1943, Chiara Lubich, 23, was working as an elementary school teacher in Trent, in Northern Italy. In the midst of the destruction and violence of World War II, together with a small group of friends, she realized that the God of Love would transform her existence, and that of many others. He showed them the meaning of their lives: to work together for the fulfillment of Jesus' prayer for unity: "Father, may they all be one". In time it became clear that God's original plan was expressed in the words: to bring the human family together in unity. In little more than 50 years, from the experience of living the Gospel on a daily basis, a current of spirituality - the spirituality of unity - has come to life which has given rise to a movement of spiritual and social renewal of worldwide dimensions: it is known as the **Focolare Movement**.

VI. SELECTION OF POLITICAL IDEAS¹²

Ideas as empty cartridges

In Chapter III we already indicated that every political decision, no matter how complex or in what area, is always informed by certain ideas.

Politicians always justify their decisions; they regard such and such a measure desirable because it is just; because it promotes liberty; because it serves the common good; because it is demanded by public interest. But what liberty really is, or justice, or welfare is decided by every politician as it were, for himself. Such deciding is loosely connected with his total view of life.

All such concepts as liberty, justice, etc., are only clearinghouses for the deep convictions of each politician. Whether he wants to or not, his own perspective on life will break through into the world of practical politics because of the content which he gives to these ideas and concepts.

That we are not exaggerating is probably demonstrated most clearly through the following two quotations in which the name of the particular political conviction in question has been left out.

1. "'ISM' is the struggle trying to create the societal conditions that enable people to develop as freely as possible. Therefore we are first of all interested in the human personality."

2. "The highest goal of 'ISM' is to guarantee freedom for an unfolding of the human personality, and to create the conditions for unlimited personality development. Thus 'ISM' sees true liberty in the most exalted sense of the word."

The first quote refers to liberalism; the second refers to communism, and is a quote from the Russian handbook, *Foundations of Marxism-Leninism*, 1962. These two quotations show most clearly that concepts like liberty, free development of the personality, etc., are often no more than empty cartridges, which receive their charge completely from the world view to which one adheres.

Which charge?

The importance of this observation is seen when one considers that concepts such as liberty, personality, well-being (shalom), etc., usually have a biblical, Christian origin. The Graeco-Roman civilization, for example, did not possess a real concept of liberty. The western concept of freedom is in its origin a typical fruit of the gospel. Concepts such as these were for the most part foreign to pre-Christian civilizations.

In other words, the gospel brings its own peculiar vision to liberty, justice, welfare, and humanity. It almost goes without saying that by virtue of this fact alone the gospel systematically confronts us with a choice in politics. Are our attitudes, ideas and opinions grafted into the original evangelical tree? Or do we easily opt for the prevalent middle class interpretation of all these ideas?

¹² pp. 31-40 in 1972 edition.

When we do, we unintentionally give our consent to the way western man has gradually annexed these ideas for his own middle class life styles. Then we share the widespread common sense view of liberty, humanity and justice, which often bears very little resemblance to the dynamism and scope which the gospel brings to these things. And the political consequences are enormous; for it is a fact that there is no single political decision which is not fed by motives of liberty, humanity, justice, and so on.

In this chapter we will try to show something of the gospel breaking through our middle class opinions and ideas of humanity, welfare, freedom and authority.

Politics and humanity

In the anthology of the World Council entitled *Christian Social Ethics in a Changing World*, professor Lochmann of Czechoslovakia tried to express the difference between humanistic and Christian love of neighbour in his essay, "The Service of the Church in a Socialist Society". He makes the following pointed observation: "Contemporary humanism tries much too hard to draw boundaries: nation, race, class, or religion. But the Christian is called to be a neighbour to his fellow man even when every natural or ideological sympathy has ceased to exist; when he can no longer see any natural or historical reason for it; when only walls or chasms of traditional enmity can be seen. In the unconditional turning to the neighbour lies the difference between Christian humanity and bourgeois philanthropy (page 246)."

I suppose there's not a single Christian who would deny that the gospel indeed speaks of love of neighbour in these terms. The love which the gospel demands of us cannot and may not be the extension of natural feelings of sympathy or traditional class sentiment - it often breaks right through these feelings. But at the same time we meet ideas and opinions which directly contradict this. All over the world as well as among ourselves, the bourgeois idea of humanity and solidarity indeed seldom extends beyond the walls of class and race. And it also scores political triumphs.

Politics which is driven by the real love of neighbour described in the gospel, cannot and may not discriminate between subjects of my own and foreign races, of my church and other churches, of the class to which one does or does not belong. The love command of the gospel demands that in politics everyone receive equal treatment regardless of his race, class, status or creed - for only, in this way are we children of our heavenly Father who makes His sun to shine down on all (Matt.5). We will even have to ask ourselves if it is correct for us only to extend aid to underdeveloped countries with non-communistic governments, and to not concern ourselves with the massive food shortages in China. Is this a pattern which can exist in the light of the gospel? Why support the fight against tuberculosis in South Vietnam and not in North Vietnam?

Politics which is directed by a middle class view of humanity and solidarity sooner or later causes the state to deteriorate into an instrument for the furtherance of certain classes, certain races, or certain groups in society. Was Marx completely wrong when in the last century he depicted the state as the instrument in the hands of the capitalistic classes?

The love command of the gospel also contains the reply to all those who would surrender politics to the prior approval of powerful interest groups, ignoring the weak in society.

Another example of failing to love our neighbours as ourselves is the deplorable

North American practice of perennially neglecting the educational needs of the physically and mentally handicapped when considering priorities for government spending.

We can't put aside all these remarks with the rejoinder that justice, and not love of neighbour, forms the criteria for politics. Indeed, justice is the basic starting point from which any government has to approach its citizens. But this justice is encircled by, opened up by, and gains depth through the command that we shall love our neighbour as ourselves. And the decision as to whom is our neighbour is not left to our feelings of sympathy or class. For it is precisely the weak, the ones without justice, who need our love. And in politics love means that we exercise justice.

Politics and prosperity

The middle class view of prosperity, which has held the upper hand in politics for years, narrows down to a maximum production and maximum possession of goods and services. It has only gradually been recognized that giving constant priority to this prosperity can mean a great deal of harm to society. In the last century this harm consisted of a rapacious expansion at the expense of the health of the labourers and their families; in this century harm comes to expression in the extreme pollution of our environment (air, water, and soil pollution), in the commercial dominance of cultural expressions and behavioral patterns (consider commercial television and the sub-conscious influence employed by modern advertising techniques), and sometimes in callously laying off employees. When prosperity is mentioned in the Bible it is very far removed from this middle class materialistic view of prosperity. In the Bible prosperity (shalom) means first of all a harmony of peace, well-being and justice for the whole nation. There is no real prosperity when excessive luxury and bitter poverty live in the same nation; or when high production and consumption levels and an enormous - sometimes unnecessary - variety of products go hand in hand with a destroyed nature and a neglected quality of life. There also appears a crack in our facade of riches when it is built at the expense of living conditions in other countries or at the expense of certain groups in our own midst. For then the harmony between material prosperity and justice has been fundamentally disturbed.

We shall take a closer look at this when we discuss aid to developing countries. For the moment it is sufficient to point out that to give in politically to the bourgeois concept of prosperity has until recently led to great harm for our society. Even in the evaluation of individual prosperity, as distinct from social prosperity (roads, recreational facilities, etc.), a strong note of bourgeois and egotistical self-satisfaction can be detected.

Politics and liberty

We are all familiar with the exclamation: "Liberty, how many crimes have been committed in thy name!" But we often overlook the fact that our own current middle class notions of liberty are dangerous points of departure for political action. The common bourgeois concept of liberty is that one has the freedom to do what one wants. The less I have to be concerned about others, the more freedom I have. But the gospel gives a radically different version. Here freedom means first of all: a task, calling, a norm. "Stand then in Liberty!" Evangelical, biblical liberty means that we stand in relationships which have been restored by Christ. Free in the gospel means that we have been liberated from slavery; not only from the slavery of the letter of the law, but also from the slavery

of our own egotistical desires. To this freedom, which spontaneously leads to service for others, the gospel still calls us and everyone else each day.

Seen in this light, the highest goal of a political program which is gripped by the liberty of the gospel can never be that people receive the greatest possible room to manoeuvre to do or not to do what they feel like. Rather, this kind of politics would be intent on letting life unfold along the lines of restored relationships. These are relationships where, for instance, employees and employers can meet each other in the factory as people who both have been addressed in the same way by the one gospel; where rivalry between firms does not degenerate into dishonest and pitiless war; where the producer is no longer instrumental in driving the consumer to selfish and egotistical addiction. Restored relationships are those where exploitation of fellow men disappears. On the international level it means relationships in which one country would no longer need to be a mere extension of the will of other nations or power blocks in order to safeguard its own existence.

In many respects we are far removed from the liberty of these restored relationships. In certain ways - only think of international block formation and the threat to the real liberty of the consumer - they even seem to slip further and further away from us. Revolutions are fermenting in several places in the world; and although they seldom bring real freedom, they are signs that suppression and theft of freedom are on the increase. Our world is on the road to enslavement or liberty; and at the fork in the road the gospel stands as a signpost of real liberty and hope.

It is all the more important therefore that we let go of our concepts of liberty-gone-bourgeois, and again learn to recognize what liberty really is in the gospel sense. When, for example, a government aligns itself with the liberty of restored relationships in its own country or in the world at large - which sometimes demands a far-reaching interference - then we must have the insight to see that it is very unbiblical to brand this interference as an encroachment on our liberty.

This initially begins on a small scale, on our own national level. When, for example, the government makes an end to the misuse of certain positions of power in the business world - e.g. the power to fix excessively high prices by enacting prohibitive legislation, it is particularly unjust to depict this as a necessary encroachment upon the liberty of business life. For the government in this case does not restrict freedom but the misuse of freedom. The basis of our political economy should be that the meaning of human freedom as well as economic freedom is encapsulated in just service to our neighbour. Hence government offers the best protection possible for economic freedom when it insures that economic activity actually gets around to this neighbourly service.

A politics which attunes itself to the freedom concept of the gospel is also able to escape the danger of onesideness in government. In the past, liberalism and socialism have been especially influenced by a certain onesideness in their political conceptualization. Liberalism saw the liberty of citizens as totally concentrated in their individual civil rights, property rights, contractual rights, etc.; socialism, in reaction to this, viewed liberty as consisting mainly of equal economic status and opportunities.

However, if we approach the liberty of citizens from a Gospel perspective which puts service first, then it becomes clear that both civil rights - as well as economic opportunity belong together, and that they ought never be played off against each other. Government is to have an eye for the civil rights as well as for the economic existence of its citizens to the degree that they need both of these in order to function properly. With

respect to both of these things, government, in its unique task, must lay the groundwork so that citizens may have the opportunity to build free lives in service to others. For this reason there also exists the *necessity* for adequate public provisions (roads, recreation, etc.) for adequate social security, welfare, and employment. All these provisions are necessary to make citizens really free, e.g. free for service to their families and their fellow man.

Just as we should be happy with the changing opinion regarding prosperity, so we can be grateful that slowly socialism and liberalism have become noticeably less onesided in their views on human liberty. Although it is equally true that partly because of the shift they have come dangerously close to the bourgeois concept of liberty which we described above. But let's not fool ourselves: many contemporary Christians are still heavily influenced by these concepts.

Politics and authority

It is here that Christians interested in politics have been strong supporters of 'law and order'. They have pointed at the exalted nature of authority, which necessitated resolute action against all forms of rebellion. The underlying conviction must undoubtedly be appreciated that authority forms an indispensable element in every human society so prone to sin. The Bible clearly shows in several places that the relationships between authority (or leadership) and subordination are not demonic, but have been intended to safeguard human society against chaos and injustice. Christians worthy of the name would be unfaithful to the gospel if they tolerated or welcomed in their ranks anarchistic tendencies which reject governmental authority as such.

However, this does not remove the fact that in these same Christian circles authority has been spoken of and is still spoken of in very un-evangelical fashion - as a completely autonomous entity which is to be honored in all its expressions without objections. Thus any criticism of the various manifestations of authority is already branded beforehand as undermining authority and revolution, no matter whether this concerns government-citizen or employer-employee relationships. Why is this so unbiblical? Those who in this way approach and appreciate authority in fact pay homage to an idea of authority which has been twisted in an individualistic, and therefore humanistic way. Those who speak or think about authority this way place authority in a kind of vacuum in which the will of the individual ruler is decisive. So in fact the exercise of authority becomes an extension of the humanistic goal of man as a law unto himself.

The gospel really speaks in quite a different way about authority and lines of authority. It doesn't only posit norms for subordinates (for example: the norm of obedience), it norms both subordinates and those in authority. All those who exercise authority in any way are subject to the norms which God has posited for authority in every sphere of life. And these are norms which always find their character and content in service to God and neighbour.

Hence it is extremely dangerous to dismiss beforehand any criticism of the manner in which existing authority is exercised. The authorities themselves can sometimes be directly responsible for a crisis in their authority!

The term 'anti-revolutionary', as Groen Van Prinsterer said many times, may not be narrowed down to protection of governmental authority against anarchistic threats. For the term includes an openness to any criticism which has as its aim a more

responsible functioning of authority as true service; and it also includes an active working for the realization of *that* kind of authority.

When for example, active resistance grows against the governments of certain South American countries which allow social injustices to exist and afford protection only to the strong, then this resistance may very well be an expression of the upholding-indeed of governmental authority, even if it manifests itself in the sharpest possible criticism of those in power. In circumstances such as these the words of Groen become fully actual again, even for 'anti-revolutionaries': "I must even be jealous of the title revolutionary, as soon as revolution means a just reformation according to the demands of the time and circumstances" (1847). One who blocks the reformation of authority under these circumstances must be called - using Groen's own words - a contra-revolutionary, not an anti-revolutionary because he doesn't choose the side of a just but of an unjust exercise of authority

The idea of the state

After our attempt to place current political concepts such as freedom, love of neighbour, prosperity and authority, in an articulated biblical framework, it might be well again to demonstrate the decisive significance of the content of political ideas (in a completely different fashion) by briefly considering concepts and ideas on the nature of the state.

In Protestant Christian circles it has been the followers of the philosophy of the cosmonomic idea (especially Dooyeweerd and Mekkes) who have worked intensively to develop a Christian idea of the state. And as a result of their penetrating analysis it appears that there is always a parallel idea of the state hidden behind the way in which political content is given to concepts such as freedom, prosperity and authority.

For example, the orthodox liberal conception was that of the formal constitutional state. The purpose of the state was to unceasingly uphold existing individual civil rights. (Compare the typical liberal themes in Ch. III). Within that formal constitutional (legal) framework, according to liberal opinion, the highest attainable well-being for total society would come to pass automatically. This was viewed as the 'ordre naturel', the natural order of things. On the other hand the typical socialistic ideal of the state is that of the socio-economic welfare state. In socialist thought the special purpose of the state is to take care of the total community from cradle to grave.

It appears from these two descriptions that ideas concerning the state held by various political directions are indeed pure extensions of their own concepts concerning freedom and justice. The same accents appear. Thus the formal constitutional state is the state which must realize freedom in the liberal sense; the socialist caretaker state is the state which must bring liberty closer to reality in the socialistic sense.

The biblical idea of state, in distinction from both these other ideas, has sometimes been characterized as the idea of the justice-in-fact state. One could put it this way: according to the biblical concept, government should be measured in all its decisions by the yardstick of strict justice with respect to all its citizens; a justice which, may not be eroded to the point of mere protection of existing civil rights, but which is serviceable to the true 'liberty' of the citizens in all societal sectors. Hence the term 'justice-in-fact' is employed, not 'formal-legal justice'.

Sphere sovereignty

To indicate that the relationship between government and all the other spheres of society (business, family, associations, etc.) must be one of unique service, the term 'sphere sovereignty (or responsibility)' is employed. This term goes back to the pure biblical notion that no sphere of society is more 'holy' than any other, and that therefore no single sphere (such as the state) may arrogantly seek to take over the callings or functions of other spheres. On the contrary, the state must in its own way be servicable to a normed realization and fulfillment in other societal sectors. However, it is also easy to fill up this term with self-chosen content and thereby hopelessly twist the original meaning. Instead of a continued understanding of the concept 'sphere sovereignty' as the respect which government should have for the *fulfillment of calling* in other spheres, it has been quite often made into something quite different: that government had to respect all kinds of acts in the other spheres. Because of this the concept came suspiciously close to the typical liberal way of accentuating the complete protection by government of all individual civil rights.

When we understand the idea of 'sphere sovereignty (or responsibility)' as it was originally meant to be understood, however, it doesn't at all contradict what we concluded was the evangelical notion of freedom. On the contrary, these two concepts - freedom and sphere sovereignty - fit beautifully together. For government has to serve the freedom of the people by freeing its citizens to *answer to the calling which they have received in their own sphere of life*. Hence it is a misconstruing of the idea of sphere sovereignty if, for example, one already condemns beforehand governmental wage and price guidelines as interference in the sovereign sphere of business enterprise. Such wage and price guidelines may be exactly what is needed to maintain the unique character of free enterprise, to enable business to truly serve the entire nation; for this is a norm which is given for every business concern. A government which promotes the actual honouring of this norm by business for *that very reason* honours the sphere responsibility of companies.

No new derived principles

It is not unthinkable that after reading this chapter some readers will ask themselves if we have not again constructed a number of 'derived' principles. Is it really necessary, thus one could argue, to arrive at practical political decisions only via all kinds of 'treatises' about freedom, love of neighbour, and a host of other things? Isn't that a detour, a falling back into an antiquated thought pattern? Don't the ideas and concepts given biblical content serve as a new kind of 'derived' principle?

These questions spring from a misunderstanding which we would be glad to try and remove. That we pause at great length in this chapter in considering the contest which can be given to concepts such as 'liberty' and 'neighbourly love', does not mean at all that only through these kinds of discourses a truly Christian politics can be born. Then indeed these essays and concept analyses would be nothing other than a new kind of 'derived' principles. The intention of this chapter was a totally different one - to make it clear that every politician, whether he is a Christian or not, even in the most complicated political decisions acts out of certain motives, certain views, out of a certain notion of what norms his decisions. We Christians, *before* we even know it, adhere to motives-and-views-gone-middle-class, and take our point of departure in a bourgeois notion of what is. Therefore in the midst of the most practical political question we must always be critical of our own motives, and must personally attune them to the norms of

the gospel (not theologically, but out of a living faith).

So, there has been no attempt here to construct a new detour between gospel and political practice. On the contrary, exactly because the gospel as active power directly drives us to commit certain political acts and refrain from committing others, it must be all-important for us not to confuse this 'driving' with our own middle class motives

QUESTIONS FOR GROUP DISCUSSION AND REFLECTION

1. What is justice? Can you explain the differences between the justice as it is administered in the class-room, in the work-place (by the boss, the union, the shop-steward and the workers), in the military between officers and the ranks, and in the state? Identify some of the boundary disputes and compare and contrast the state's authority with the authority of parents, teachers, the boss, the military commander and senior officers, and a church council.
2. How would you explain the specific task of the State in the administration of **public** justice?
3. List some of the "empty political cartridges" that are flying around in post-coup Fiji? Consider the phrase "going forward" as an empty cartridge. What do the various political voices mean by this term? Be brave and state your views as clearly as you can.
4. What is **political** leadership?

Should the leader allow himself to succumb to the wishes of those he leads, who will always seek to turn him into an idol, then the image of the leader will become the image of the misleader. This is the leader who makes an idol of himself, and his office, and thus mocks God?

Dietrich Bonhoeffer 1/2/1933

There is no truth toward Jesus without truth toward other people. Lying destroys community. But truth rends false community, and founds genuine fellowship. There is no following Jesus without living in the truth unveiled before God and other people. There is no way to peace along the way of safety. For peace has to be dared. It is the great venture; it can never be safe. Peace is the opposite of security. To demand guarantees is to mistrust and this mistrust in turn brings in war. Battles are won not with weapons but with God. **Dietrich Bonhoeffer**

VII. THE CHOICE BETWEEN PEACE AND DEMONIC POWER¹³

This method of giving content to political ideas is not the only political area in which the gospel confronts us with a choice. The Good.News also confronts us, together with all other men, with the choice between peace and demonic power.

Every political movement in one way or another searches for the fountain of true societal happiness. But this searching makes no sense unless it is accompanied by insight into the source of evil, of sin, of the ever-recurring misery and abuse in this present world. Politics should seek to end these things as much as possible, but it cannot do so unless it has a clear insight into the real causes of misery and abuse.

A Christian should not be a fatalist. He ought to know that much evil and misery in the world can be rooted out and can be opposed by the just use of governmental authority and by a re-formation of society. (For example, it is known that the germ for chaos and revolution can often be found in an amassing of power and riches.) But on the other hand the Christian also knows very well that a perfectly happy society cannot be built by us, because in the final analysis evil hides within man himself. Hence his deepest hopes are fixed on the city not built with hands, and his battle against injustice in this world is also meant as a proclamation of this future society, coming from God, in which justice will live in deed.

It is understandable, however, that in the eyes of many these will only be beautiful words. The idealists among them will continue to search for other ways to establish complete and final happiness in this world once and for all in spite of or because of the ever-recurring world wars and social injustices.

But how can it be found? And why is it that such happiness is too elusive? It is clear that in order to answer all these questions a scapegoat could be most useful. Some movements seek to lay the blame at the door of technology and culture, which have reduced and enslaved humanity. Others blame it on the lack of time for reflection and meditation. Idealistic political movements often seek to identify the scapegoat as a specific group or class or race. Then the only way to real happiness and the regaining of paradise lost naturally is the 'erasure' of that group, clan or race in question. The 'sacrifice' is great, and it costs much blood, but it's justified by the 'goal'.

Examples of this are known to us all, either from history or through experience. The French revolution found its scapegoat, and not without provocation, in the nobility and clergy; hence the guillotine. Communism saw and still sees, again not without cause, the capitalistic class as the scapegoat; hence the bloody revolution of 1917. Nazism saw the Jewish race as the scapegoat; hence the concentration camps as means for the "End-lösung der Judenfrage" (the final solution to the Jewish problem).

Is common sense adequate protection against a repetition of this kind of thing? No. In the final analysis there are forms of demonic power involved here that can attach themselves to every human spirit, even to the spirit of Christians who are not on their guard. Susceptivity to the demonic powers of 'erasure' is very great for all those who are inclined to seek the cause of misery not within themselves, but in others. The gospel is the only effective weapon against this inclination in the human heart. In his days, Groen Van Prinsterer wrote in similar vein against supporters of the French Revolution. The all-

powerful motif for him was, "The Gospel against revolution!"

This same thought comes to the fore in, for example, the various works of the Russian novelist Dostoyevsky. In one of his books, *Crime and Punishment*, the hero Raskolnikov is possessed by exactly this demonic power: "But if for the sake of his idea such a man has to step over corpses or wade through blood, he is, in my opinion, absolutely entitled in accordance with the dictates of his conscience, to permit himself to wade through blood, all depending of course on the nature and scale of his idea" (Part III, Section 5, p. 277, Penguin Edition, 1963).

There is indeed a real choice to be made here. A choice with enormous political consequences. Those who say yes to the gospel of Jesus Christ have discovered the strongest defense against demonic power and politics in human life itself. Those who say no to the gospel are playing with fire. And once again it is the gospel which places us at the crossroads.

The role of demonic power in war

The significance of all this for the problem of armament and the waging of war cannot easily be overestimated. When we compare the wars and armament goals of this century with those of the previous one, it is undeniable that the 'ideological' character of war has become more pronounced. In our time wars and tensions are characterized not so much by struggle over territories and territorial expansion as by a struggle which is "hallowed" by one ideology or another. Today 'escalation', the step by step deterioration of a specific political conflict, is often used in warfare. But the most serious manner of escalation is the ideologizing of a conflict, the spiritualizing of an existing conflict into a battle for the holy Pan-Arabic-unity; into a battle for the coming of the racially pure Nazi Reich; and into a battle against 'capitalism' or against 'communism'. When these ideologized goals are at stake, the hesitation to reach for arms and increasingly more powerful weapons disappears like snow in spring. Then a conflict becomes a charged struggle between spirits that can only be adequately decided through the death of the opponent.

Vietnam

By way of example, one could point to the conflict in Vietnam. This conflict has in fact reached such bitter proportions because on both sides an ideologization has taken place. In as far as the Viet Cong have been influenced by Communism this was a communistic ideologizing of the conflict; it is pictured as the battle against the capitalists, the arch-enemies of human happiness. But from the American side we also can detect a gradual spiritual escalation. Although at first the struggle in Vietnam was still represented as a struggle against Communist-led aggression, which had to be checked as aggression, slowly the view that this was a battle against communism as such has pushed to the foreground: a battle therefore in which all sorts of weapons could be used, including napalm.

This is a form of ideologizing because communism as a spiritual movement can of course never be combatted with military force. It is a misconception and therefore a form of demonization of a conflict when the assumption is made that a spiritual battle can be decided by military might.

Of course we do not wish to intimate that every military reaction to armed aggression by others is to be condemned as such. There are situations in which it would

be unchristian and gross injustice to let a destructive flood intent on murder descend upon innocent people with impunity. We remain, as Bonhoeffer and others put it, fully responsible to see to it that others don't seize weapons to destroy lives without being opposed. But we would do well not to forget that any military reply can only be judged according to the yardstick of whether or not the attempted attack on the lives of others is justified. When a military reaction is 'justified' as taking an active part in the battle of the spirits, then one succumbs, in our opinion, to demonic powers. Here it appears again that the gospel confronts the Christian as well as the non-Christian in politics.

Ideology and pragmatism

The words 'ideology' and 'ideologizing' have already been used. It is essential to say something further about these terms, because they are often totally misunderstood and misused. 'Ideology' is a word which stems from the time of the Enlightenment (the end of the eighteenth century). It then meant a basic conviction or spiritual insight which has been made to serve a practical striving after power. The word 'ideology' became especially popular when Lenin started to use it to characterize the world views which exist under capitalism. For example, he saw, in the line of Marx, the Christian faith as a typical capitalistic ideology, a weapon in the hands of capitalists to reconcile the suppressed labouring class with the continued existence of capitalistic society. Thus ideology is a religion or a view of life utilized for the practical goals of power. Communism does not mind describing itself as an ideology. Communism is its own weapon in the struggle for the victory of the labouring class. Communism from the time of Lenin has always been strongly oriented to that practical goal. Everything which serves the interests of the actual class struggle should be mobilized, including spiritual insights and convictions. Therefore one could also characterize Communism as a mature pragmatism: it stakes everything on a practical striving after a new society; even the arts, science and ethics must be servicable to this cause. A scientist, for example, does not serve some kind of objective 'truth', but must before everything else be prejudiced in favor of the class struggle. And as a consolation the communist ideology points out to the scientist that by following in the track of prejudice he will be shown later to have been 'right' when the final and complete 'truth' comes about in a communistic society.

We see then that ideology is a dangerous word. Therefore it's just as dangerous when in the confrontation between East and West one takes one's point of departure in the fact that the gospel and communism are related to each other as two ideologies. Then one admits to the Communists, as it were, that the gospel is intended to promote the continuance of western capitalism.

Furthermore, it is plain that there exist clear connections between a fully developed pragmatism and the utilization, for practical purposes, of basic convictions as ideologies. Pragmatism is an especially suitable soil for a lowering of a world view to an ideology.

This last remark is of course not without significance in the contemporary problem of armaments and war. Now that a mature pragmatism is taking hold of people more and more, the danger also increases that spiritual convictions become used and exploited to justify a military struggle; that is, without pausing to ask whether the struggle in itself should be viewed as just. Hence pragmatism could easily lead to an ideologization of a military conflict.

Along with this it is well to point out that the American way of life is already strongly pragmatic. The semi-official aid of the American government given to an organization such as Moral Rearmament is an example of how one can indeed try to use the Christian faith for practical goals, such as the struggle against communistic power and the preservation of a free western society. But before we know it, we succumb to these forms of ideologizing ourselves; the crusade mentality is still alive among many Christians.

We shall have to become completely permeated by the fact that the gospel, for example, tests both communistic *and* western societies, and that we as Christians never could or should sell our souls for the preservation of any human society. And there really exists the danger of making an idol out of the so-called free West. Karl Barth has empathically pointed this out in his "Letter to a Pastor in the German Democratic Republic", 1959. He who does not see the danger, or denies its existence, has probably already fallen prey to the ideologizing of his Christian faith without knowing it.

The role of demonic power in a prosperous society

The danger of a demonizing of life is not just limited to the area of war and armaments, even though it finds its most pregnant expression there. In the form of all kinds of addiction it can also be present in an outwardly peaceful society. And we mean addiction not only to drugs and stimulants, but also addiction to one's own possessions, often called 'materialism'. This addiction does not have to halt at the conviction of individuals, but can also take hold of an entire society. This happens concretely when, for example, the goal of satisfactory economic growth in a nation is exalted to a dogma, to which all other policies either have to contribute or be sacrificed. This danger lurks more and more in the West now that communism has started to increasingly emphasize that the struggle with capitalism will be decided in the economic sphere. Communism wants to prove before attentive audiences in developing countries that its economic system is superior to that of the West because it is capable of bringing about a larger annual economic growth. Through this the West is indeed led into the demonic temptation of viewing this as the only and decisive yardstick of its societal system.

Over against this we most certainly have to point out that the stimulation of economic growth may not be viewed as the only criteria of a specific societal structure. And for a prosperous society this is doubly true. Economic growth is necessary in so far as it can provide conditions for freedom and social justice, and not the other way around. It would be folly crowned as wisdom if an already prosperous society, for the sake of a little bit more prosperity, would endanger real freedom and real justice.

Apart from this we have to view the poverty which reigns in other parts of the world as a mortgage on the prosperity which we have reached. We will have to accept without rancor a lessening of our own level of prosperity when that is necessary to help start a process of economic growth in other parts of the world. Facts and developments point out more and more clearly that the necessity for this lessening of our growth indeed exists.

QUESTIONS FOR GROUP DISCUSSION AND REFLECTION

1. Do some research on "just war theory". Are the principles of "just war" theory relevant to the problems Fiji faces in relation to overcoming "coup culture"?
2. Does Fiji inherit some traditional ways of resolving disputes and doing business that need to be overcome by strengthening the more positive features of Fiji's traditional life? What were some of those negative features (mentioned in **Island of Hope** p. 7), how are they manifested today, and how might they be overcome?
3. What are some of the problems that result from recognising the presence of evil in the world? How does the Gospel teach us to respond to evil and how should that teaching influence the political **path** on which we walk?
4. Is discussion about demonic powers helpful in Fiji's current political context? Why? Why not?

No Interest Loan Schemes

In Australia, the Good Shepherd Youth and Family Service has, over many years, developed a No Interest Loan Scheme (NILS) - small no interest loans are offered to people on low incomes for the purchase of essential household goods. When a borrower makes a repayment to a NILS loan, funds are then available as a loan for someone else in the community. Here's what some NILS recipients say:

I've got 4 kids. We'd been living out of an esky to keep our food. So much got wasted because it went off. I had to buy each day and often that would be at the milk bar. It was costing me a fortune and we were going backwards.

With kids you need to wash a lot. My hands were sore from hand washing for so long. If I went to the laundromat it would cost me \$12 to do it. I rang up [NILS] in tears.

My hot water system broke. There was hot water all over the floor. The gas company came but I didn't have the money for a new one. I had to boil kettles of water to have a bath or wash dishes.

I'm a single mum with 5 kids in a small country town. I've just been diagnosed with Hodgkinson's Disease. I need to replace the wood heater with a new system. I can't keep chopping wood and I need proper heating so I get fewer infections

VIII. THE CHOICE BETWEEN WHAT IS AND WHAT OUGHT TO BE¹⁴

The gospel confronts us with the choice between what is and what ought to be. In the history of the Christian Church it has become evident again and again that there are great dangers for Christians on precisely this point. The early Church 'was so convinced that the Christian has no abiding city in this world that it sought to escape as far as possible into otherworldliness. In the reaction which followed, however, people turned to the world with such enthusiasm that they made the salvation of existing structures and situations one of the goals of their own participation in society.

The view of society which existed in the middle ages canonized, for example, existing societal relationships by arranging them in the form of a pyramid, according to the Pauline example of the one body of Christ with many members which need each other (I Cor. 12). In this structure everyone had to remain in the class or rank in which he was called (with an appeal to I Cor. 7). Thus the history of the Christian Church resembles the steady swinging of a pendulum between shunning and accepting the world between negation and affirmation.

But the Reformers, however imperfectly, pointed out that these were not the only two possibilities. A Lutheran saying, popular in Norway, gives voice to a third possibility: One can at one and the same time be a full citizen of the earthly kingdom and the Kingdom of God. Those who want to live by the gospel will for exactly this reason turn also to this world and its citizens. The idea has sometimes been expressed like this: a man is converted twice-first from man to Christian, and then from Christian to man. The gospel points us to God, and because of that, back to the world again. But at the same time this evangelical orientation to the world could never be an orientation which is at peace with everything that exists in the world. For citizenship in the Kingdom of God will express itself in our desire to foreshadow that coming Kingdom in this world, and search for the justice of that Kingdom in earthly relationships. Not what is, but what ought to be, must be the yardstick of our actions.

The choice that confronts everyone is found in the gospel, and not in our own inventions. The gospel is a power unto salvation not only for individuals, but for communities and for nations as well. It doesn't safeguard communities as they exist now, but looks forward to 'salvation' in the future when Jesus Christ returns again. To save human society for the future will require us to work for basic changes now. Not just any change will do (then we'd exchange conservatism for progressivism), but changes which make society just indeed.

Architectonic criticism

In this connection, Abraham Kuyper, the leader of the nineteenth century Dutch reformation, once coined the term 'architectonic criticism' - a critique of the architecture, the very structure of our society. This societal structure demands revision, especially at all those points where the structure itself gives rise to sin, evil and injustice. For the sake of the gospel we should never be at peace with these elements of human societal structure.

The clearest example of this is the critique Kuyper himself gave of the society of his days. At that time there reigned an unchecked competition between businesses, a competition which was so severe that it extended to the wages and contracts of employees. One factory would try to take advantage of another by lowering wages and involving the wives and children of its labourers in the production process.

Kuyper clearly saw that this 'social question' couldn't be reduced simply to the immoral conduct of the individual entrepreneurs. Anyone who didn't engage in these practices could expect nothing less than bankruptcy; he was simply pushed off the market by his competitors. Hence Kuyper came to the conclusion that the very structure of society itself gave rise to this evil and injustice. Societal architecture forced businessmen to commit injustice towards their labourers.

Kuyper's solution to this problem was far ahead of his time. He asserted that the social aspect of economic life was fundamentally broken, and that therefore only the bringing together of employers and employees could create a climate within which the evils could be rooted out. So he proposed a nation-wide programme of voluntary, systematic collaboration between employees and employers in different industries; an idea which he changed into a proposal to enforce such a systemic collaboration by public law when in 1910 there was still no evidence of a willingness to meet together by employers and employees. Kuyper's insight into the necessity of bringing management and labour together gradually came about in the Netherlands, and finally made it possible for both sides to agree on nation-wide collective labour contracts for separate industries. These contracts, arrived at through consultation of national management and labour leaders, made wages a factor placed beyond the competition of the market place. Labour conditions were then agreed upon beforehand, independent of the competition between various firms in each of the industries. The structure of society had been changed; it no longer gave rise to this particular form of unbearable injustice. This societal restructuring was completed when subsequently these collective labour contracts were made law by the government.

This whole story is important because it illustrates clearly that the very structure of society itself can give rise to injustices. To put it differently, a Christian approach to politics can't restrict itself to the limited area of individual ethics; it will have to embody a large part of social ethics. It isn't enough for a Christian approach to politics to call individuals and groups to charity; the government will have to intervene in the societal structure so that it becomes a framework creating more just circumstances to prevail.

Developmental aid

Another example of evil and injustice is the continually widening gap in prosperity between rich and poor countries. In this area of widespread concern we shouldn't put all our eggs in the one basket of insufficient private charity, but we've got to be aware of the structural roots of the problem.

The great gap between rich and poor countries is in fact a legacy of the colonial past of western countries. Even if they didn't directly exploit their colonies, without exception they all failed to enable the peoples of these countries to start their own economic growth; all these countries could not break through the desperate cycle of developmental aid is no generous gestures on the part of the West but the payment of a moral debt.

When we try to uncover the structural roots of this worldwide 'social question' a little further, we discover that one of the basic reasons for the widening gap appears to be that the West has the tendency to translate each growth in prosperity into an equivalent growth in consumption, which in turn leads to new investments which are oriented to ever more luxurious consumption. In other words, the West in its prosperity structure is oriented solely towards itself. Because of this a structural disharmony has been precipitated on a global scale. Here in the West the societal order is oriented to the stimulation (for example, through advertising) of ever newer and more luxurious needs to consume. These needs in turn guarantee a sufficient market for various multinational corporations, while elsewhere in the world the stage where the most elementary needs can be met has yet to be reached.

Thus the global economic picture exhibits two completely separate chains of events. While in the poor countries this chain consists of 'poverty - some prosperity - population growth - poverty', the chain in the West goes: 'prosperity - the stimulation of new wants - greater consumption - higher production - new prosperity'. In startling contrast to the stimulated new wants in our countries stand the blatantly unsatisfied needs of the rest of the world. It is clear that these two chains find their root in a western societal structure that will have to be given a different orientation - no longer an exclusively inward preoccupation aimed solely at increasing existing internal prosperity, but an outward orientation aimed at decreasing the poverty of others. You could compare it to what Churchill did in England during the war years. In the same way that he reshaped England's peacetime economy into a war machine so we should reshape our economy into a developmentally harnessed economy.

How this goal can be reached is not easy to determine, and more study is required. The following possibilities might serve as suggestions for the time being:

- + Intervention in the want-stimulating process in the western world; reflection on the advertising phenomenon.
- + Promotion of a world economic system in which there is a just distribution of labour, capital and industrial activity in every country; abolition of all trade barriers for the products of underdeveloped countries in our western markets.
- + Introduction of a conscious choice between our prosperity and the poverty of others in all phases of our income, planning and disbursement processes, as well as in all phases of policy formation.
- + Greater tax exemptions for gifts to developing countries; special taxes earmarked for developmental aid.

In contrast to these proposals, compare the U.S. Congress' decision to cut off all foreign aid, perhaps because of a diplomatic defeat in the U.N. over the seating of mainland China. Such an act of blatant disregard for weaker nations is hardly acceptable for those who realize the responsibilities that western countries bear for the gross underdevelopment of many South American, African and Asian countries.

The Corporation in our society

In corporate life the distinction between what is and what ought to be confronts us in a twofold way. First, is the corporation structured with justice for all of its members? And second, can an enterprise deal justly with others - the consumer and other

businesses? Keeping in mind what we said earlier, the central problem in both of these questions appears to be whether the present modern corporate structure directly causes injustice, forming a roadblock in the path of the harmonious development of the corporation according to its own distinctive norms.

So it isn't our purpose to find out how we can subject business enterprise to the 'sovereign' will of the state or community. The real question is how government can provide a framework through its legislation so that the business enterprise will be able to grow and unfold in real, normative freedom - a development that isn't lopsided because of injustice.

The Internal Yardstick-the corporation as community

From widely varying viewpoints much has been written about what a business concern ought to be. However, in a Christian social movement there is one recurrent, overarching theme: that the enterprise ought to be a community, or at any rate ought to show some of the characteristics of a community. On this point the Christian social movement in the Netherlands from its very start distinguished itself from the typical socialistic train of thought. The socialists believe that the enterprise can never be a true community because within it there is a fundamental clash between the interests of capital and labour, the exploiter and the exploited. For example, the report of the Wiardi Beckman Foundation, *The Reshaping of the Corporation* (1959), declares that the enterprise does not have, nor ought to have, the character of "Gemeinschaft", but of "Gesellschaft". A business is nothing more than a forced cooperation between individuals who because of their own interests depend on cooperation, but who have nothing more in common.

Hence the restructuring of boards of directors in limited companies has been suggested. The directors appointed by labour and the directors appointed by stockholders will have no other duties except respectively defining the interests of labourers and stockholders in the company. The directors aren't responsible for the development of a company as a whole unit.

Why did the Dutch Christian social movement from its very beginning emphasize the communal character of a business enterprise? Because all those who are involved in the enterprise – employers, employees, and stockholders - are more than merely representatives of certain sometimes sharply opposed, interests. They are before all else living people who as people are subject to the commandment that they love one another as themselves; and that includes the sphere of industry as well as the rest of life. As people they've all been placed in one societal sphere, and within that sphere the great love commandment must be made effective in one way or another. The gospel doesn't come to a halt at the gates of the corporation; it places its evangelical demand for love of neighbour within the various enterprises no matter to which 'group' or 'class' that neighbour may belong.

The purpose of business

That public opinion has largely lost sight of the communal character of a corporation is probably due to contemporary views of the purpose of an enterprise. The purpose of a business is often seen as consisting of and being limited to a striving toward the greatest possible efficiency in the production of goods and services.

Those who hold this view have little argument with the dominant role played by the conflict between labour and capital in business because if business only has an economic goal, then economic interests and conflicts of economic interest must be emphasized. But then the business enterprise is denatured. For the meaning of business isn't exhausted in a striving after the most efficient economic production. As one of the papal encyclicals has rightly pointed out - in industry people as well as products are being formed. In business much of the life of all those who labour is determined, and the foundations for happy or unhappy lives are laid; here a person's vocation is either frustrated or fulfilled. There is more involved in business than the production of goods; a responsibility to give meaning to many human lives is at stake. And at the same time the contribution of business to human society resides in broader economic goals.

Ownership in industry

Our position isn't just a string of moralizing statements everyone can subscribe to; when this position is taken there are real political consequences. Usually people reduce a company to the place where they work. The only thing that matters there is a businesslike efficiency. Only industrial class interests meet. Because of these attitudes and practices, great misconceptions have crept into the question of 'ownership' in industry.

For years the thesis has been defended that those who provide the capital are in fact the legal owners of a business enterprise. This thesis is (apart from the process of growing independence of the corporation from the direct control of the stockholders) indeed completely acceptable to all those who view a factory as a place of work containing machines operated by the labour force. But when one rightly understands an enterprise to be a social unit in which there is daily cooperation between co-related, living people then it is utterly impossible to see those who furnish the capital as the owners of the enterprise. For that would boil down to a sort of slavery, to a situation in which live people themselves are objects of ownership during certain hours of the day. Those who furnish the capital are not the owners of any enterprise; they are, at most, the owners of the means of production, of the capital invested in the enterprise. The evangelical distinction between what is and what ought to be inescapably confronts us here.

Clearly this point of departure carries with it important political consequences. For if those who provide the capital cannot be the owners of the enterprise, that dynamically interrelated societal cooperation, then they also cannot lay claim to a full account of what the enterprise has done with their capital investment. Those who view a business not as a societal structure composed of living people, but as purely an extension of the interests of those who provide capital, do injustice to the real concerns of that business and have in fact adopted a piece of pure capitalism. For the word 'capitalism' means that 'capital' has been accorded a dominant place in human society.

To put it differently, the enterprise, as a living work community of entrepreneurs and employees, has a right, if necessary, to maintain its own integral societal development notwithstanding the pressure exerted by those who furnish the capital.

Gerbrandy, the great Dutch pioneer of the Christian social movement in the years before World War II, once correctly expressed this as follows:

The existence of the labour community has consequences just as much as the existence of the national community. From an existing labour community flow worker demands which you might ignore for many years, but which you can never destroy, because they form an essential ingredient of that labour community. It is understandable that an entrepreneur says: this factory is mine. But the workers, through whose labour alone this bit of capital becomes productive, could and should say, even if the expression then has a different meaning, this factory belongs to us. The very sad thing in our situation is this: people sense the danger that the function of the entrepreneur might be attacked in its very marrow, but what they do not see is that a business can be attacked as well in its very marrow by the violation of the function of labour. Many do not see that this has already happened, and that nature is busy reclaiming her rights. (*The Battle for New Social Structures*, p.164)

The External Yardstick free enterprise

The problem of industrial structuration can also be put in more general terms against the background of the service which business has to perform for society as a whole. Here the thesis could be defended that precisely because the interests of capital often play such a dominant-role in present-day industry, a business cannot sufficiently fulfill its own independent service to society. In other words, the present structure of business is open to a structural critique.

This thesis needs further clarification; this can be done most easily by first observing some random examples of high-handed action by industry.

High-handed action towards consumers: the tendency of producers to artificially reduce the life expectancy of their product (planned obsolescence) to ensure greater sales in the future; the tendency towards commercial control of cultural expressions (for example, commercial television) and commercial behaviour patterns (via new advertising techniques).

High-handed action towards the environment: not taking sufficient precautions against air, sound, water and soil pollution; fire hazards, etc.

High-handed action towards employees: the sometimes premature and unnecessary firing of employees during financial difficulties.

Of course these examples aren't given to single out particular businesses. Contemporary entrepreneurs aren't usually bent on exploitation; where the enumerated evils still exist, particular businessmen are often concerned about them. But this individual concern indicates that attacking these evils is not just a question of raising personal standards of conduct. The fault lies deeper; it's hidden in the very structure of today's enterprises. These often faulty structures force just about every entrepreneur, no matter how well intentioned he may be personally, to participate in existing patterns of evil in certain respects.

The central problem once formulated by Goyder, the English Christian entrepreneur, is this: "Does existing corporate legislation and existing business law sufficiently create the conditions business leaders need to balance the interests of stockholders, employers, consumers and members of the local and the national community while still pursuing their economic task?"

Of course the answer is no. Present business legislation so heavily accents the relationship of corporate investors that corporations have great difficulty getting around to dealing justly with the interests of their employees and consumers, for example. The scales on which business leadership has to measure all these interests aren't fair, and aren't accurate. A sufficient return on capital investment in a business can sometimes weigh so mercilessly heavy that often employees are fired too quickly, and the interests of consumers are neglected out of hand (if it means higher profits), and there is little responsible precaution against pollution of air, water and soil. In other words, business isn't free enough to adequately provide voluntary service to the rest of us fellow human beings - its neighbours.

Perhaps a quotation from a report in 1965 by the (Dutch Telders Foundation is more convincing than a long argument. "In many companies, especially the large diversified ones, continuity of employment opportunity can go hand in hand with the greatest possible earning power. But when the demands of earning capacity and employment opportunity clash at some point, in the interest of the whole society earnings should be decisive."(pg. 96) In other words, the value of continuing employment is considered of no importance when compared with the demand that invested capital show a maximum return! This is a patent example of how absolutistically profit considerations still control the way many people think and act. The corporation ought to be able to act out of a broad view of (social) profitability that includes respect for the just interest of others (employees, consumers, etc.).

That some great public corporations have seen something of this vision, and have expressly formulated this in their charters (that not profit but continuity of employment comes first), is already an important step in the right direction. But these examples are limited to some form of guaranteed annual wage, and usually don't go much beyond insuring the interests of the employees a little better.

Therefore government should contribute to a structural change in industry through its corporate legislation. Here are some concrete avenues which are open:

Introduction of legislation enabling employees or their representatives to participate in corporate policy decisions where vital employee interests are at stake.

Following Goyder's idea - the granting of a special title (Goyder mentions the term: Public Company) to those enterprises which have shown that they are capable of and willing to act responsibly toward employees, consumers, and society at large.

Laying down general rules for the composition of corporate boards and industrial directorates so industry can be profitable in the broad sense mentioned above.

In conclusion, neither the false spirit of corporate liberalism nor the equally misguided schemes of the latest socialism can answer to the gospel of Christ which calls the structuration of economic life into obedience. The Word of God detects, liberates and directs. What is isn't what ought to be.

QUESTIONS FOR GROUP DISCUSSION AND REFLECTION

1. Can you specify some of the central ideals of Fijian and Indo-Fijian communities? Have these community ideals been actively sought in political life? How can the ideals of various communities be resolved within the one political system?
2. In what ways are Fijian communities - of all ethnic and cultural backgrounds - developing life-styles that diverges from the dominant materialism and consumerism that relentlessly circles the globe looking for a place to land. How can these alternatives be strengthened by concerted political effort?
3. Develop a list of NGOs and other charities and keep a record of all the good programmes that are being developed. Find new efforts that are being started and see if there are ways in which you can become involved.
4. List some of the prominent features you think should be included in any "architectonic critique" of Fijian society.
5. How can Fiji's political parties become more attuned to the voice of young people?

Lopeti Senituli - Tongan Democratic Activist

Did you know that the man who currently advises the Tongan Prime Minister was part of a Tongan effort that took on a biotech company owned by the man who was President of the Melbourne Football Club and with a former Australian PM on its board? His name is Lopeti Senituli.

The company, Autogen Limited, had announced through the Australian Stock Exchange Office in Sydney that it had signed an agreement with Tonga's Ministry of health to establish a major research initiative that would, in effect, have given over patent protection to genes isolated from the Tongan pool. The Tongan Human Rights and Democracy Movement led the resistance to this attempt to colonise Tongan genes. Their campaign began with this statement:

Existing international intellectual property rights laws favour those with the technology, the expertise and the capital. We have none of these. All we have is the raw material - our blood. We should not sell our children's blood so cheaply.

"The Gene Hunters" September 2002 edition of New Internationalist.

It is colonialism all over again. Three centuries ago they came for sandalwood. Today [they] are after our genes! In our opposition to the Autogen agreement we were also calling on His Majesty's Government to put in place national legislation and regulations that would ensure that proposals like Autogen's must first run the gauntlet of all legal, scientific, cultural and ethical requirements before they are even considered. On 13 February 2002, the Cabinet approved the establishment of the National Health Ethics and Research Committee. We are deeply moved. But there is no rest for the wicked. We still have to fight for civil society representation in this new Committee. That, as they say, is another story!"

IX. THE FORMATION OF POLITICAL OPINION¹⁵

In previous chapters we've attempted to show something of the gospel challenge in political life. The gospel continually tests those who bear political responsibilities; and under a democratic system of government we all shoulder this responsibility in a sense. The gospel points the way in political life by confronting us with true freedom and justice (Ch. VI); by indicating the only satisfying way in which man in society can be saved from demonic powers (Ch. VII); by remaking and reforming that which is into that which ought to be, freeing the structures of society from the power of injustice through the searchlights of redemption (Ch. VIII). This recognition of the gospel's own testing power is of unbelievable importance for Christian politics. But to this point we have only had the totally indispensable background out of which our political action has to develop, and to which it constantly will have to come as a proclamation. But how does actual political work develop? And how does the background we've discussed come into play? It should be obvious that answers to these questions can only really be given in political practice itself. But some general guidelines can be given which may be useful in practice.

Needs and their representatives

In day-to-day politics a sound political judgment almost always evolves in a process of searching out, testing, and harmonizing needs. So we'll pause for a moment to look at this process by giving an example. A question common in North America is whether or not government should intervene where the rapid expansion of cities results in land speculation and geographical problems.

The searching out of needs

Gathering as complete a picture as possible of the needs which are to be satisfied is the first phase of political opinion formation. Roughly speaking, needs fall into two categories. The first category consists of special needs of societal groups (farmers, pensioners, middle class, etc.) and societal structures (families, businesses, clubs, organizations). The second category might be designated as general or common needs. Examples of general needs would be sufficient employment opportunities, public order and morality, public mental health, stable currency, social stability, peaceful co-existence between nations, and sound U.S.-Canadian relations.

To obtain an adequate panorama of all the needs bearing on a specific political problem, we must have a thorough knowledge of the nature of the political problem. Such a fact-finding tour often takes considerable time and energy. As far as the urban problem is concerned, for example, we can specify among others, the following needs:

a. Special needs:

Needs of a city population for adequate recreational facilities, adequate transportation, pure air, room for housing development.

Needs of the surrounding rural population for adequate room to operate, conditions favorable to production (roads, orientation to markets).

Needs of business enterprises for possibilities for expansion and new branches, a good infra-structure.

b. General Needs:

public health (in connection with air and water pollution)

spiritual health (recreation, city planning, objections to urban anonymity and alienation)

good water and soil conservation

keeping taxes at an acceptable level

The evaluation of needs

The second phase of political opinion formation is much more difficult than the first. The weighing and ranking of the various discovered needs are at stake here. This is an inescapable task when needs threaten to clash in one way or another. The real political problem is hidden in this clashing of needs.

With respect to the needs enumerated above, this threatening clash appears to exist on several points:

The needs of the city dwellers for more recreation and more room for building expansion seem to clash with both rural needs for adequate room to operate (farms of sufficient size), and industrial needs to expand and settle new areas. Some industrial settlements conflict with needs for optimum public health because they create air and water pollution. Some industries even 'get in each other's way' because of a limited amount of available industrial sites, especially along major traffic arteries.

Increased social legislation, desired by most groups, finds itself confronted by the general need for a reasonable tax level on the needs of tax-paying families and businesses. In the very nature of the case, these needs come to the fore in every governmental measure which costs money.

All these needs have to be evaluated; their relative importance in relation to each other has to be determined. Is the need for more roads greater than the need of taxpayers for lower taxes? Are the needs of a metropolis weightier than those of farming communities?

It is exactly at this difficult point of evaluation in the political process of opinion formation that the context of previous chapters becomes fully relevant. For in the evaluation of interests, no one can leave his convictions at home and every political direction brings its own opinion to bear.

Consider for yourselves:

1. The interpretation one gives to concepts like freedom and justice causes a weighted interpretation of specific needs (Ch. VI).
2. The needs of segments of the population which are considered 'road-blocks'

on the way to a better society will be held to be of no value or will even be weighed negatively (Ch. VII).

3. 'Vested' interests will receive extra emphasis from those who tenaciously hold on to what 'is'; and they will be regarded lightly by those who have unbridled passion for change (Ch. VIII).

Example 1: the 'freedom' to settle in any city will be considered more important by conservatives than by socialists, since for the conservative an individual right is at stake! The conservative will also defend the interests of the taxpayer, for paying taxes limits the rights of private property.

Example 2: the interests of property owners will be completely or almost completely ignored by those political streams which put a high priority on the need for a continual expansion of commercial interests in a city.

Evangelical politics will certainly have to apply its own typical yardstick to this evaluation phase:

It will have to see these needs in the light of evangelical concepts of justice-against the backdrop of the peculiar calling and service which subjects have to fulfill in their own sphere of society (families, industry, etc.). Freedom to establish a business in any location, for example, will have to be evaluated according to the meaning that this freedom has for a proper fulfillment of service and task on the part of business with respect to members of the enterprise and society as a whole. When the level of taxes is to be determined, evangelical politicians will have to ask themselves what effect a higher tax would have on the functioning of families and businesses according to their specific natures. An evangelical politics shouldn't judge needs in the light of existing societal power structures, or knuckle under to pressures brought to bear by one political interest or another, but it should give special attention to the needs of the weak and the powerless. It shouldn't be satisfied with an evaluation of needs as they manifest themselves in an existing situation, but should above all evaluate these interests against the background of the desired direction of society, taking into account the structural critique which is necessary at certain points in our society together with the needs for a harmoniously functioning society in the future.

This last point, for example, demands that in the problematics of urbanization a judgment be formed concerning the land use situation which could come into being in the long run (in 1980 or 2000). Against this background several needs are placed in perspective. Agricultural production for example, will only be able to maintain itself if it modernizes in larger units of production, which are, moreover, attuned and specialized to the needs of an adjacent population center. In the light of this, future traffic problems receive a greater urgency, and so do the recreation problems of large cities. In this long range perspective the politician discovers the harmful effects of a widely scattered population in rural areas far away from cities. One learns to appreciate the great importance of a settlement policy concentrating on viable living centers. All of this undertaken with the realization that in the future families and farms alike must be enabled to keep fulfilling their service, and may not be frustrated by surrounding land use barriers. The real 'freedom' of a people is at stake here as well.

The harmonizing of needs

The last phase gives rise to the most just policy. In this phase a solution which brings genuinely realizable harmony among those interests has to be sought among the clashing needs which have been discovered. During this last phase wisdom and a keen sense of justice are indispensable prerequisites; if a person is suited for political work, it will be evident here.

It's very difficult to be more specific at this point, but we can make two observations. First, it is a good approach to compare different solutions with one another and to examine how just each is.

Second, a solution often presents itself when it is recognized that interests, if evaluated properly, often are more interrelated than might appear at first glance. The most harmonious and just solutions are those in which all overlapping and combinational possibilities between the varying interests are utilized to the fullest extent. For example, agrarian and municipal interests compliment each other when agrarian production finds a market in the city, and when it is in the city's recreational interest that agrarian elements be included in the recreational landscape.

QUESTIONS FOR GROUP DISCUSSION AND REFLECTION

1. What the world needs now is love! Reflect upon this line from a well-known song and discuss the strengths and weaknesses of the viewpoint. What else has to be said here? Could politics be one form of love, one way to serve our neighbours?
2. Think about the phrase: "resolving conflict in the Fijian way", "resolving conflict in the Pacific way". What valuable traditions and principles are being appealed to in these phrases. Try to formulate in clear terms what "the Fijian way" or "the Pacific way" can contribute not only locally, but regionally and globally.
3. Organise a meeting with various candidates from various parties. Find out what these people think. Ask them what they think the dominant needs of Fijian society to be.
4. Collect together the various manifestos of the different political parties. Keep a record of their public announcements and explore their policies.
5. Would a movement of reconciliation that aims to bring healing to the Republic be worthwhile? Why? Why not?

Forgiveness and reconciliation are complimentary processes. To reconcile with other people you must first forgive. If you don't forgive, any shake of the hands you do, any embrace that you hate to do, you do because people are looking at you, will not mean anything. If we can forgive we can liberate ourselves.

Xanana Gusmao

X. THE FORMATION OF A CHRISTIAN PARTY¹⁶

Thus far the central theme of this book has been that the ultimate concern of Christian politics doesn't lie in what Christians could or should accomplish, but in listening to what the gospel itself, through its own initiative, presents as the choice - a choice it continually places before the politician in the midst of his political activity.

By its very nature this theme also has consequences for our thinking about the possible formation of a Christian party. If, in the final analysis, our own Christian activities were central in evangelical politics, then indeed we would have to view the establishment and maintenance of Christian parties as a 'dogma' from which we could never depart. But if what is at stake in evangelical politics is following (and pointing to) what the gospel itself is already doing - challenging Christians and non-Christians alike - then it is impossible for us to regard the formation of Christian parties as a dogma. Whether to form a party should be determined by asking if it is the most effective instrument, in a given time and place, to implement the demands of the gospel in politics. Thus a Christian political party is no more than one of the organizational forms available for evangelical political activity. It can never be an end in itself and neither should it be.

Whether or not a Christian political party is indeed the most effective instrument depends, as we said already, on times and circumstances. Some of the factors which could play a role here are:

The electoral system of a country

When a certain country uses a district or riding system and Christians form a minority group, then a splitting off from the existing large parties may sometimes result in isolation and a missed opportunity to influence these parties.

The character of existing parties

The formation of a Christian party can be an inescapable necessity in a country where the existing 'secular' parties demand total loyalty to their own 'principles' and 'ideology', while in other countries existing election platform parties might give the Christian room to promote his own conviction.

The knowledge and insight of the Christian community

Christian politics demands both political expertise and a living faith. Either one, or both, could be missing to such a degree among the leaders of Christian political groups, that their public action might break down rather than build up the Christian witness. The establishment or maintenance of a party could be irresponsible in such circumstances.

In addition to this, any Christian party will have to face with open eyes the possibilities of failure, and must not equate the content of its actions with the normative demand for 'Christian politics'. The word 'Christian' reminds the party of its subjection to a norm - the word Christian is a reminder, a 'tap on the shoulder' and by no means should it be allowed to become a 'pat on the back'. Should the party use 'Christian' in such a self-congratulatory way it will

immediately remove itself from the reality which the word 'Christian' represents.¹⁷

Arguments in favour of Christian party formation

Some of the positive arguments which, with varying emphases, can be adduced for the establishment or maintenance of a Christian political party are:

'Secular' parties, even when they welcome Christians as members, can often only allow these Christian members limited room. Things are all right as long as the Christian can endorse the party platform out of his own convictions; but it's distressing when a Christian on the basis of his convictions comes to political conclusions other than the one his party is advocating. Then it often appears that these parties value the political convictions of the Christian only when they result in loyalty to, the party line. In a Christian political party, however, an appeal to the gospel as the religious basis of the party is always possible in principle.

Except in exceptional circumstances, Christian politics can never be a one man show. For deepening and correction it requires communion with fellow Christians; for it is basically one of the cultural expressions of the Body of Christ (which may not be identified with existing ecclesiastical structures). It is a perennial question whether this need for experiential community in political activity can ever carve out enough room within secular political parties. A Christian political party by its very definition is already oriented to giving form to this communal experience.

One of the characteristic signs of our time is the secularization and estrangement of practically all sectors of life from the influences and impulses of the gospel. Closely connected with this trend of secularization is the fact that ideological parties are dropping 'out of fashion' and that politics is viewed more and more as an autonomous activity which requires only politically neutral technical expertise. In the midst of a party system organized according to purely pragmatic motives, a Christian political party could be living sign of the fact that the Kingdom of Christ does not stop at the gates of politics.

Under a democratic form of government, citizens as well as ministers and members of parliament are responsible for the direction of official policy. As Christians we could and should value highly the ability to express with our votes that policy formation can only be correct if politics is faithful to the gospel. But when Christian politicians join one or more 'secular' parties, then usually the possibility of expressing this conviction with his vote no longer exists for the Christian citizen. For when he votes for a fellow Christian who is a candidate for a 'secular' party, his vote in effect goes to that party. An independent candidate could be elected into the House in a specific district or riding, but where this is the case the voters have already in fact formed the basis for independent political action on the part of the chosen delegate who, for the time being, forms a kind of party within parliament.

¹⁷ Editor's comment: In the 1972 edition this paragraph reads: "In addition to this, the Christian party will have to be confronted with the essential demand that it have open eyes for the possibilities of failure, and thus must not equate the content of its actions with 'Christian politics'. The word 'Christian' posits the norm for the party to pat itself on the back. When this is done, it is often furthest removed from the reality of the word 'Christian'." The phrasing is unfortunate; the meaning is that the word 'Christian' gives no ground for self-congratulations.

In our time political problems are becoming more and more complex in character, and it is virtually impossible for the citizen to come to responsible judgment on all the various political problems. Thus in some measure at least, he has to respond by intuitively trusting the spirit of a party tackling old and new political problems. It is a realistic question whether any voter can ever get a sufficient hold over the dominant spirit in parties relying solely on ad hoc election platforms. This problem wouldn't be helped by a very detailed program because in a period of four years new political problems constantly appear. In the long run a party built on principles will win out over a pragmatic platform party. You could even put it this way, because of the spiritual tie which exists between voters and representatives, the democratic influence of the voter who votes for a principle party is in fact deeper and longer lasting than that of the elector who votes for a certain party program.

A conditional yes

When we review the factors and marshalled arguments, it appears that we are fully justified in giving a conditional 'yes' to the future of Christian party formation. The little word 'conditional', however, is indispensable - especially in connection with the future. And that conditional element is related to two things; in the first place, whether a Christian party remains willing to recognize the possibility of its own failure (and consequently rejects all temptations to identify its program with the message of the gospel which transcends *all* programs); and secondly, whether it is and remains willing actually to open itself to the penetrating work of the gospel. Otherwise it has little in common with the Christian faith except its name, and it makes a laughing stock out of the gospel.

Both these conditions are essentially marching orders, tasks, and responsibilities. Don't let anyone tell you that Christian political action is obsolete. There will always be room for real evangelical political action; the gospel itself is always active in politics and in the entirety of life.

QUESTIONS FOR GROUP DISCUSSION AND REFLECTION

1. What political parties claim to be Christian? Examine these parties manifestos and identify the major ideas that are central to their policies.
2. What political parties are avowedly secular? What policies of these parties could attract genuine Christian support? Examine other religious views upon all parties.
3. How do the different political parties define the task of government?

You must be strong enough to forgive first. Then you make the steps forward to shake hands or to embrace somebody. But forgiveness is the first thing. The first challenge that you face. You forgive or not. And if not no reconciliation can happen.

Xanana Gusmao

Afterword: Face to Face with an Island of Hope

Part 1:

Towards public justice in a post-colonial situation

BCW: How has the world changed since you first wrote **Grote Taak** in 1969?

BG: *The changes have been immense if we think about the end of the cold war, the fall of the Apartheid regime, the rise of new environmental problems and changes to information and communication technology world-wide. But then the changes have not been so immense if we think about the dominion of Western powers over the world's economy and the persistence of so many poor and oppressed peoples.*

BCW: Why, do you think, it has taken such a long time for a Christian political option to reach the former colonies of Christian Europe?

BG: *Think about it this way. The former colonies were societies which were introduced to an experience of a great distance. They still retain this experience because it was built into the resulting culture, and it can be said that the colonial powers could maintain their control by this distance. And so, think about it, Christianity itself, as a way of life, could then be experienced as something that has its true reality a long way away. But the power of the gospel as God's living and healing word, tells us of the Love of God here and now. And any Christian political options, whenever they arise do become influential when they are lived, as a way of life, when they are lived out in practise as a path, a way, along which we can discover concrete expressions of justice and peace.*

BCW: Do you have any comments, as a professional economist, of the overall economic strengths and weaknesses of European Christian efforts to take the Good News to the peoples of non-western and southern countries?

BG: *There is no doubt that we have seen a motivation of genuine Christian charity behind the desire of giving and increasing the effort to promote so-called 'development aid' to poor countries. Many, not all, western Christians have been involved in this and to some extent it has been helpful, especially in medical and educational services. But the most glaring weakness was, and still is, that Western Christian blindness to the way its other hand, using harsh economic self-interest, has unjustifiably reaped huge interest for itself on its loan capital, by spoiling the environment, and also, last but by no means least, by enforced increases in exports to the North which leave little or no room for an indigenous development of home-markets in the South.*

BCW: You refer to North and South in cultural terms.

BG: *Yes. I do that because in the "South" we find people living who for generations have been exploited both in **culture** as well as in **nature**. The resultant cultures of the South, particularly in their economic sides, have been shaped to serve the North because it was - how can we say it? - within its reach, clay between its hands.*

BCW: What can we learn from economics about the way Christianity was brought to the South Pacific and Fiji in the 18th and 19th centuries? And how will that help us focus our work for justice?

BG: *Let us not forget that the message of grace, peace and personal redemption was offered to many people with the best intentions, even when the good news was not accompanied by building and working via schools and hospitals. But it was also often, at the same time, an isolated effort. The Christian norm of **Public Justice for all** implies that in each culture there should be public protection of the weak against the possible misuse of power by the rich, to ensure that poor*

*families can live in human dignity. The Biblical concept of Jubilee implied that poor people were allowed, each fifty years, to return to the land they had lost, which tells us that also today we, and with us the government of course, should strive for a fairer distribution of the land, particularly where deep inequalities have crept in - deep inequality is a sure sign of **public injustice**. Usually, those aspects of the Gospel were with-held, or, if they were transmitted, they were told as simply ideal pictures rather than matters for implementation.*

BCW: In 2001, a World Council of Churches (WCC) conference was held in Nadi. The Pacific Conference of Churches produced **Island of Hope: the Pacific Churches Response to Economic Globalization** - this outlined an alternative to the unjust domination of economic systems that are part of economic globalization. How does **Face to Face with Justice** - which initially appeared in 1969 - support and extend **Island of Hope** proclaiming a Christian vision that gives priority to relationships, celebrates quality of life and values human beings and creation over the obsessive production of things?

BG: *In 2001, I functioned as personal advisor on Justice, Peace and Creation to WCC staff and was therefore also involved from the Genevan side in the preparation of, and giving input to, this ecumenical conference. I see **Island of Hope** as a living Christian testimony which is fully in line with what I wrote in 1969. The way I referred to the risks and darker sides of the obsessive production of things was also present in **Face to Face**, but in a more rudimentary and therefore not as fully fleshed out as in the **Island of Hope** document. Take, for example, the term 'neo-Liberalism' - its present meaning of market-fundamentalism was not known in 1969.*

BCW: Can you briefly outline for us some of the policy suggestions you have made in connection with your role in the World Council of Churches consultations with the World Bank and the International Monetary fund?

BG: *Firstly, we rejected the excessively strong emphasis upon exports in the advice that was being given by these Institutions: the priority, we said, should be given to home-market development, wherever possible. Secondly, we stressed the right of each citizen, as citizen, to have already access to clean water, which is quite different from becoming a client to a water-company. And thirdly, we claimed that the economy of the United States should not be exempt from the rules of structural adaptation which both institutions have so often, so eagerly and so loudly advocated for so called less-developed countries. This is only a selection; also, of course, we asked for a radical revision of the rules of representation and voting in these institutions. More can be found at the website of the WCC (search for the encounters of 2006/7 between IMF, WB and WCC and look for the headings: agreements and disagreements.)*

BCW: Can you give us some ideas about the limits of the cash economy and how we should seek to develop a dual economy without becoming totally dominated by the world financial markets.

BG: *That is not easy. Let me just restrict my answer to one basic rule, namely, that the yearly creation of debt-money by banks should never go beyond, or at least far beyond, the growth of the yearly Gross National Product of the country concerned. It was because that rule was overridden that the growth of debt money multiplied, year after year, by a factor of four, in terms of the real economy. That was why the so-called 'financial sector' could recklessly expand and grow above our heads.*

BCW: In basic terms, how would the policy of extending to poorer countries **Special Drawing Rights** from the resources of the WB and IMF help Fiji and the other island nations of the South Pacific?

BG: *SDR's are forms of money, given by the IMF to member states without costs, according to the size of their GNP and their export level. But exemptions are there: Russia during its reconstruction received for instance (and under US pressure) a special round of SDR's from the IMF. Now a special round is needed, in my view, for all poorer and indebted countries, as a*

means to fight against the present economic world crisis. Why should the recovery come only via the IMF supporting efforts of the rich countries for their own economies? I say, let the recovery also come via the South, and surely not only via the North .

BCW: And what would be some of the problems that the South West Pacific would have to overcome in order to form a regional economic community on the model of the European Community? Could it be done? What are some of the related economic problems that would have to be overcome, so that the larger countries of the region like Australia and New Zealand could lend authentic support for such a regional project of economic integration?

BG: *I am very much in favour of such a regional economic community. Such working together with regional neighbours makes a nation far less dependent upon the international institutions. But then, more is needed than merely a kind of fair trade agreement, with some guarantees against inequality of competition. Sooner or later, there should come a kind of monetary integration with its own distinctive kind of currency , and with rules against governments of member countries running up massive deficits. There is a long way to go, but it is possible.*

BCW: Speaking of Europe - one way of viewing the emergence of the EC would note that Europe has become united politically in its response to the privations and disasters of the 20th century. Both wars were in large part fought on European soil. The disastrous depression of 1930s and the Cold War of the 1950s to 1980s coincided with the rise of the ideologies nationalism and militarism, many with a European base. Is regional integration only possible after massive disasters? What will the South West Pacific need in order to build a cohesive economic and political region? Is it possible?

BG: *The present economic world crisis illustrates very clearly that the dependency of the world-economy upon what happens financially in the big western economies has become simply too great for the other, more "Southern" countries. That is a deep enough concern – and it will become still deeper - that will prompt the start of new negotiations. There is great confusion as in the time of David and afterwards when the kingdom was shaken to its foundations: Flee back to your own tents, O Israel.*

BCW: In many ways the Kingdom of the Netherlands has long been a shining example of cohesive integration, of peaceful co-existence between various religious and ethnic groups. How is it faring these days?

BG: *Yes, but by now it no longer self evidently a society of real tolerance. But there is a considerable effort to fight intolerance and reinstate peace between the different religious and ethnic groups, on a basis of genuine mutual respect. This can be seen especially in neighbourhoods where the tensions are high. School-education, police-protection, intensive social work, dialogues between churches, mosques and synagogues. In such processes everything is involved. The basis concept is not that we have to tolerate each other, but rather that we need each other and can complement each other.*

BCW: Do you have any suggestions for Fiji in terms of the just public integration of Fijian, Indo-Fijian and Rotuman populations? How can the rights of minorities, also tiny minorities, be cherished and protected by all?

BG: *Though I live far away, I do not doubt that the starting must be a legal, public protection for each group involved in the Republic, without discrimination on religious or traditional grounds. Every human being is more than an individual - it is a pure Enlightenment myth view that human rights can be constructed on the idea that the human person is the final indivisible atom of society. No. Human rights should also have more dimensions than what is ascribed to isolated persons, and it should be extended to group-rights, especially to be used in the appeal in court in times of any abuse of power, either economically or politically. Without that basis, any society, sooner or later, will tend towards corruption and finally disintegrate. We live, to quote Desmond*

Tutu, in a moral universe, a world which is built on the premise that evildoers will ultimately fail.

BCW: How can the interests and needs of indigenous communities intersect with those (variegated) of communities of the descendants of the indentured labourers from the sub-continent brought to the islands between 1879 and 1915?

BG: *Here I am inclined to refer you to the difference between affirmation and self-affirmation, as it was introduced by the Dutch Christian psychotherapist, Dr Anna Terruwe, and which also became a basis from which the Anna Frank Foundation was established. You recall Anna Frank's diary - she was the Jewish child who was killed in the second world war because of her Jewish background. Self affirmation is self-oriented boosting yourself up, the effort of giving yourself and your group a higher self-esteem by looking down on others and glorifying your own achievements in terms of power and wealth. Affirmation, on the other hand, is outward looking, seeking to lift up those who see themselves as weak and less worthy, and establishing in them the awareness that God loves them and also wants their Shalom. Jesus affirmed the socially despised Levi (Matthew) a 'tollenaar' (Dutch word for tax collector) by merely saying to him: "This evening I will have dinner together with you in your own home." And that turned Levi into an open and generous human being. Self-affirmation stands over and against every true form of integration, as becomes also visible in the title of that sharp and critical book by two black sociologists : Why America needs racism and poverty (James and Mary Tillman, 1969). The white and rich part of America needed racism and poverty to build its higher, imaginary self-esteem which was and is completely false The choice for Obama therefore also feels like a kind of national repentance which I also wish for Fiji.*

BCW: Can you briefly point us to a clear principle by which we can say that a tolerant, multi-racial society is good for the economy, or conversely why racism and majoritarian rule is bad stewardship for everyone involved?

BG: *In India, as an example, the economic development in the countryside was and still is heavily disturbed by a class system which excludes men and women of the lower castes, preventing them from drinking from the same village well as the higher castes. Every form of racism with discriminatory rules splits a society into some non-participating parts, which then destroy the basis for a healthy division of labour and a responsible use of common property— like lakes and oceans with their fish*

BCW: We come to the end of Part I let me ask, somewhat controversially, can you explain to us why, from an economic point of view, a parliamentary democracy is usually to be preferred to a government that depends upon a military takeover?

BG: *Parliamentary democracies sometimes function in chaotic ways. We see chaos in government when the different parliamentary groups misuse their own democratic rights as elected representatives and seek to undermine other groups by lies and all kinds of tricks, or by simply trying to gain the 50% + 1 majority in order to implement a kind of dictatorial rule. But there is one decisive trait - which can be found even among parliamentary democracies that are not doing so well, and that is that the voice of each elected group is heard publicly, and that citizens may, after a time of serious mismanagement decide to elect others in the hope of gaining better representatives. Obama has now, as it were, a chance to send Bush home, which he would not have had if there was not democracy elections in the US.*

Perhaps I can also illustrate this further by pointing to the concept of loyalty. Loyalty to your own family, culture, and nation is very important part of lending support to your own society. But only if, and so far as, it is given voluntarily and expressed truthfully. As soon as someone claims from me that I should be loyal to him, and especially to him (with some kind of exclusion to others) loyalty has lost its heart and true basis. Often regimes with a military origin, or, even more importantly, with a military style of social behaviour, claim loyalty to the dominant power even before something really good has been done by them. That may need to be part of the logic

of an army, but it is surely not the style of living and behaving in a healthy and diverse society. Transplanting the logic of an army to the whole of society destroys the roots of true loyalty in society itself.

BCW: So finally. how do you, as an economist and former parliamentarian view politics?

BG: Politics, whether people or governments like it or not, are always an answer - a response, to the divine mandate of justice. That can be a negative response, for instance when the interests of the poor and needy are neglected and the desire of politicians - the servants of justice - to remain in power dominates. But in **Face to Face with Justice** not only one, but two things are shown. Firstly, that there is always the possibility of a positive and fully just response, however dark the situation may appear; which is also true for Fiji. And secondly, that if governments follow the Way of an unconditional public justice, sooner or later a real blessing is always guaranteed. For God's promises are not empty. Peoples and governments all around the world, Fiji not excluded, fare well when they choose their political coordinates according to justice. My prayer is that Fiji may also follow this track, also for its own wellbeing

Part II:

Gaining a Public Justice Focus on the Credit Crunch

BCW: Let's move on to the current Credit Crunch. Is this a genuine crisis for all the peoples of the world? Or is it just something that has arisen because the rich cannot gain more from their high-yield short-term investments?

BG: *The panic of the rich who have become obsessed with high-yield short-term investments is not irrelevant but it is more a powerful symptom of something much deeper that is wrong. In this sense the panic has simply brought to the surface what many have been warning about for a long time.*

BCW: Yes, and you have been one of those. So what are suggesting is that the "Credit Crunch" is not really the crisis - the crisis goes deeper. So can we put a name on it?

BG: *The word "crisis" has indeed resurfaced, with commentators comparing today's credit crisis with the crisis of 1929, just before the Great Depression. But unlike the early thirties, there is now a greater alertness by most governments that counter-measures have to be taken. Sometimes in a way which does look strange, for instance by just expecting that more and more money input in the economy will do the job. As if money can save us ...*

BCW: And is that activity itself the rock bottom problem here?

BG: *Not exactly. Almost no one speaks about the deeper causes, clustered around the enormous growth of the supply of debt-money in this decade, far beyond the growth of the real economy. The statistics describing that growth are not public information - and that, already, is a tell-tale sign.*

BCW: So how do we interpret this? I can imagine that some readers will immediately suspect some kind of conspiracy, shadowy figures manipulating behind the scenes to maintain their own interests.

BG: *That is so but when we are discussing this tell-tale sign we are also discussing the way public authority has been used, or more precisely abused, in order to build many private empires of financial power, often by way of continuous speculation in the so called new financial markets. And so things get out of hand and admitting that things are out of hand simply seems*

to make matters worse.

BCW: So this has been going on for some time.

BG: *Yes indeed. Recent estimates suggest that for a full decade the annual growth rate of debt-money has grown four times the rate of the so-called "real" economy.*

BCW: So what is "real" growth in the economy? How is this to be measured against the "unreal" growth of created debt-money?

BG: *Real growth can be seen here as the widening or expansion of what is produced and sold in terms of tangible goods and person-to-person services. That also means that a slight rise in the availability of money in any society will be needed so that trade, consumption and production are not hampered by a continuous fall of prices. But what we have now seen in the last years, is that most of the created money was used to buy and to sell so called "derivatives": pseudo goods, with values of a very speculative nature.*

BCW: So where did all the new (unreal) money go?

BG: *It was poured largely into the new money markets - those that have been called derivatives, such as options and futures. These were often traded in relation to an expected future price of currencies and resources.*

BCW: So this money is created in the present against what is anticipated in terms of the growth that such money will generate in the future? Sounds like the producers thought of themselves as Midas.

BG: *Or maybe **Dr Faust** in the famous theatre play of Goethe is an even more appropriate figure. Dr Faust was tempted by Mephistoteles, the devil, to use more and more of his own self-printed money to seduce people and to gain the world.*

BCW: And where did all this new (unreal) money go?

BG: *Well the new money flowed where the other money flowed, into all kinds of new financial "products", including credit default swaps and packets of mortgages. In other words, money has become something one can buy and sell as a product in its own right.*

BCW: But not without the pull of a futuristic vision of continued speculation...

BG: *The staggering growth of liquidities was mostly absorbed in these highly speculative markets, thus not leading to much inflation in the real economy. Economist Herman Daly recently calculated that the amount of paper exchanged for paper is now twenty times higher than the amount of paper exchanged for real commodities. But now the enormous balloon of collective speculation has burst, people have lost confidence, and the real economy is deeply threatened.*

BCW: So what principle can you suggest to us about how to deal with our speculation about the future value of ... money. You're not saying that speculation is wrong, are you? Rather you are saying that the world over people suffering the impacts of speculation that has got out of control.

BG: *Yes, that is correct. There is, however, a huge difference between speculation as a possible temporary option of some one investor, and speculation as a profession, especially if it is able to drive up the prices of even the most essential goods - food for instance - needed by the poor. That is also morally a sin, and should, in my view, be prohibited.*

BCW: So it is not just a mechanical matter - feeding our hopes and desires into a machine and deriving whatever we think the machine can give us without over-heating.

It reminds me of a situation described to me by a friend: he doesn't have that much money, and he does not want his life to depend on technology and yet drives an 18 year-old car around with minimum maintenance. He was to take his daughter on a trip and realised he needed new tyres. But when the mechanic put the car up on the hoist, the car he had been driving around without much maintenance was exposed; my friend was confronted with the fact that it was about to fall apart. It would be very costly and he was given the option of paying for the tyres and leaving or allowing it to stay up on the hoist to allow the mechanic to complete the overhaul. In terms of my story, it sounds as if those making policies for the world's financial system some decades back simply decided that it would be too costly to admit that adequate care had not been maintained on the machine and decided to merely pay for the tyres and keep the bonnet down. And that simply is an irresponsible risk not only to the driver but to the passenger.

To return to the Credit Crunch, Bob, what do you think has been the **fuel** that has brought us to this dangerous and precarious situation.

BG: *In basic terms we could say it is Greed and Magic. This story suggests that underneath the current developments lies the driving power of greed. Greed has driven not only private or collective speculators but also the once-reliable banks. The creation of liquidities was the first economic sector to be fully privatized.*

BCW: What do you mean by liquidities? Is this another way of talking about "cash-flow"? And can you put this in some kind of historical context for us?

BG: *OK. Liquidities can be seen as a kind cash-flow, in which also the credits which were given to you - created by banks (i.e. debt money) are included. For centuries, the state had the monopoly over the creation of money. But in the new order, banks are able to create enormous amounts of money. They then fully engaged in the speculative process themselves, and in doing so enabled themselves to recoup their money with huge profits.*

BCW: Can we put this in day-to-day terms. If I go to the "hole in the wall" more than 5 times a month, I am then charged for every time I extract my money. Is that what you are referring to here in relation to banks making huge profits on the money it holds?

BG: *Yes, because banks both large and small banks have a capacity to open accounts for their clients according to the size of the financial capital available to them. So the larger banks could open far more disposable money-accounts for their clients as the size of their own financial capital grew. Ratios of twenty to one were not uncommon, the most speculative banks even loaned at a rate of thirty to forty times, especially in the highly speculative so called hedge funds – funds which have no other purpose then to allow corporations to have a higher level of short term profitability in favour of their shareholders.*

BCW: So how does greed function in the operation of banks? And is greed the only factor?

BG: *We have come to a situation in which to understand money we also have to reckon with the resurgent part played by magic in everyday life. In Goethe's **Dr Faust**, power was conferred by magic. These days the making of printed money - the creation of electronic, "virtual" money - confers power as if by magic. It opens doors, doors which can help people gain more and more control over investments and thus to acquire greater material wealth and luxury. These doors are also opening the imaginations of people. And so it sounds like we are confronted by a powerful instrument by which, if we know the right magic formula, we can achieve almost every objective we put our minds to.*

BCW: But it is not "all in the mind" is it.

BG: *No. There is much more. Money sets people and markets in motion. In its very modern character it is a dynamic phenomenon. And so up until this day, financial markets remain the most rapidly growing markets. By its dynamism, money has become a Guide which society must follow wherever it leads.*

BCW: Well some might not see that as problematic? If everyone is led by the same dynamism, doesn't it lead to healthy social integration?

BG: *It is merely a poor fairy story in which everyone was wishing and able to comply with the same dynamism. Keynes once used the metaphor of giraffes: they can reach to the highest branches of the tree, but who is counting all the vegetation that has been trampled under their feet by such efforts to reach as high as possible. Here we confront the question of why we are here. Who are we? Were we born to fight and to shop? Doesn't the dynamism of money indicate that we are ensnared by a false god. The bible refers to false gods as idols. We're the victims of Idols which we have made with our own hands.*

BCW: Well, we had better get a clearer idea of who we are then?

BG: *When we sense the presence of idolatry in our lives we need to stop. The essence of idolatry is that the combination of high expectations and fear will narrow a person's consciousness. One's focus becomes a matter of finding the right interaction with your "god". At the same time, you delegate power and influence to your god, so that you allow it to take the lead. It then prescribes patterns of obedience.*

BCW: Can you illustrate with a concrete example where this is evident?

BG: *Consider recent developments. Financial markets were actually given control over the real economy. "At last", declared the President of the German Federal Bank, "politicians have been brought under the control of the financial markets."*

BCW: And what are the implications, say, for us here in the South Pacific and in Fiji.

BG: *Many countries, especially in the South, live in fear of what speculative capital flows might do to their economies. One little rumor, such as a possible devaluation of the relevant currency, and capital can abandon the country just like a flock of birds will scatter when they hear a gunshot. It can leave overnight. It will then find somewhere else to land, where it can feed and reproduce itself.*

BCW: And this is also one important facet of "globalisation".

BG: *Global capital constantly ricochets around the world, driven by its quest for maximum short-term financial gain in a climate of changing expectations. This is sometimes called the new Big Brother syndrome. Governments lower their taxes on capital and burden their economies with huge expenditure cuts, just to remain acceptable in the "eyes" of this new, ever-watchful Big Brother.*

BCW: The global financial markets

BG: *Clearly, an idol has arisen, bringing with it more fear, even terror. We have put our trust in the financial markets to save our real economies. But now the idol is staggering, as idols usually do, and in the pull towards a deep recession we begin to realise more clearly than ever that it has profoundly betrayed us.*

BCW: And so this seems to indicate that the Credit Crunch is related to the problems we are confronting with climate change.

BG: *Like it or not, because climate change and environmental degradation are linked to the world of the real economies, they are also linked to what happens in the financial world. The linkages exist as economic and spiritual processes. Economically, we see that the incessant*

drive of the rich countries to become ever-richer in material terms has cast dark shadows over our climate, because of the highly intensive use of fossil-fuel energy, with its accompanying greenhouse gas emissions. Indeed, that drive looms ominously over the environment as a whole, bringing with it pollution, devastation of landscapes, loss of biodiversity, and other forms of destruction.

BCW: And what about the massive economic development outside the capitalist countries?

BG: *China, India and Brazil increasingly use and pollute. But note that also this economic expansion – though China is a more of a case on its own - is profoundly enforced, accentuated and aggravated by pressures emanating from the financial markets. Driven by greed, the financial markets focus primarily on short-term profitability, not on long-term investment. As a result, firms and corporations have been forced to merge or simply to jettison any priority not focused on increasing shareholder gains in the short-term.*

BCW: And so employment as such is in some ways opposed to sustainability and conservation.

BG: *This rigid enforcement means that companies and governments pay less and less attention to climate change and other environmental concerns, especially where environmental protection measures reduce profits. If we live and move in a financial climate of money and greed, then the actual climate will always suffer.*

BCW: You seem to be suggesting that we need to gain a new holistic approach to what life is, what it is for and what it can be.

BG: *Spiritually, the potential solutions to today's global financial problems, and our global environmental problems, are deeply hindered by what we might describe as a superficial view of human happiness and well-being. The assumption is that more material prosperity, which we assume is made possible by more money, will give us all that we need. This modern understanding suffers from a profound lack of shalom.*

BCW: Shalom? Lack of shalom? You are implying a restless unhappiness among the people's of the earth, not only in the South and in poorer countries.

BG: *It is no surprise that a deep-down unhappiness grips the lives of people. The materialistic view of the good life, promoted by massive advertising campaigns, is a sign of the adoration and veneration of idols. It is a sign of following a false shepherd, a deceitful guide in the pursuit of a seemingly new life. But Jesus is the Good Shepherd, and "the sheep follow him because they know his voice" (John 10:4). In this text, Jesus also uses the word "abundance": "I have come that they may have life, and have it in abundance" (v. 10). Life must be preserved so that we may enjoy it in abundance.*

BCW: What then might following the voice of the Good Shepherd, preserving life so that all may enjoy it in abundance, look like in the midst of today's economic, environmental and spiritual crisis?

BG: *Let me propose a way forward; a public justice approach. A public justice approach suggests that governments call upon citizens, banks, institutions and other economic actors to assume, rather than renege upon, their own respective responsibilities. Government initiatives must operate at this level, thus going well beyond implementing mechanical solutions. Without a renewed sense of human responsibility government initiatives will not contribute to a genuine way forward.*

BCW: Can you describe such policies in general terms?

BG: *In the short term, in the present crisis, a healing step would be to make government action, such as the so-called bail-outs, conditional on mortgage-holders, banks, the automotive sector and other economic actors assuming their respective responsibilities. Perhaps, the most effective*

approach would be to begin where the problems began, namely to make government support of banks and mortgage-holders, including those who pushed relatively poor people into seemingly cheap mortgages, conditional on those institutions eliminating mortgages in which interest payments escalate after the first year(s) of the mortgages.

BCW: A changed view of interest in money transactions?

BG: *The same interest level should apply throughout the life of a mortgage as in the first year. amortization rates ought not to increase. This would make it possible for at least a segment of homeowners to keep their homes, and it could help to restore confidence in the economy. In relation to the banks, government support should never be given without an agreement, in writing, that lending and credit practices return to the principles of healthy banking. The main problem has been that banks lent and gave and even enforced credit in an extremely careless, speculative, and expansive manner (expansive in relation to their own capital). If bonuses for senior executives are not to be abolished altogether, they should at least be severely restricted and capped.*

BCW: What about the supply of international finance?

BG: *In the middle and longer term, a change in the structure of the national and international monetary system has become unavoidable. There has been an obvious failure of financial oversight by the US FED and the International Monetary Fund (IMF). One sees this in the almost complete lack of regulation of speculative modes of investment, not to mention the speculative movements of global capital. It is noteworthy that the ability to regulate destabilizing international capital movements remains intact in the Articles of Agreement of the IMF.*

BCW: So you are assuming that the IMF will need to be restructured?

BG: *The primary task of a newly structured IMF will be to create and maintain stability in the world's monetary order. This implies that the creation of new international money must serve the growth of the real economy, not the other way around; heavy restrictions will have to be placed on speculation; and that nations altogether out of balance financially, such as Iceland, are rebalanced.*

BCW: And what about poorer countries? How are they to have a say in all this?

BG: *In a restructured IMF, the countries of the South need to have a real say in decision-making, and the United States must be subject, as any other country is, to the same international rules. In that new constellation, the IMF should focus its concern deeply upon economic and financial problems as well as grasping the issues related to the world's environmental and social sustainability. It must find the just path to stimulate possible and desirable economic growth rates for North and South. Further, it should institute a fairer distribution of new international money, perhaps in the form of its Special Drawing Rights, but only where poor countries have a meaningful voice and share in the distribution.*

BCW: Thank-you Bob. We look forward to hearing further from you as time goes by.

BG: *Jesus calls us to preserve life in order to enjoy it in abundance. But where, in an already rich society, material abundance itself becomes our goal, the target of maximization, then all of us, animals included, lose life and are left empty. What good is it to conquer the world but lose your soul, your life? Is that not the message of the Gospel for today?*

We, as nations, firms, consumers and producers, can indeed be guilty of poor stewardship, of significant economic mistakes, and therefore should be held accountable by the whole of society and mankind for what we do;

Can we acknowledge that nature and social life are not restraints (limits) to what we want, but are given to us, as human beings, as parts of our own human condition which demand our respect; and

Do we dare to embrace the realism to have done with societal narrow-mindedness and hypnosis, and to throw our self-made idols away since it becomes increasingly clear that they only "live" by the "grace" of an never ending terror.

Could it be that Western Christians are the greatest stumbling block to a renewed appreciation for responsible care of our world? Could it be that Western Christians by their practice prevent the redemptive potential of responsible care from coming to expression? If so, then that means that future mission endeavour has to be directed at converting Western Christians.

Bob Goudzwaard

Select Reading List

Bob Goudzwaard **A Christian Political Option** Wedge, Toronto 1972

_____ **Capitalism and Progress - A Diagnosis of Western Society** Wedge and Eerdmans 1979 2nd Edition 1997

_____ **Globalization and the Kingdom of God** CPJ Washington 2001. Available on internet at <http://www.cpjustice.org>

_____ & Harry de Lange **Beyond Poverty and Affluence: towards a Canadian Economy of Care** With a Forward by Maurice F Strong, Translated by Mark R Vander Vennen, University of Toronto Press, Toronto 1994

_____ & Harry de Lange **Beyond Poverty and Affluence: towards an Economy of Care** With a Forward by Maurice F Strong, Translated by Mark R Vander Vennen, Eerdmans Grand Rapids and WCC Geneva. 1995

_____, Mark Vander Vennen & David van Heemst **Bhope in Troubled Times - a New Vision for Confronting Global Crises** Forward by Desmond Tutu, Baker Grand Rapids 2007.

_____ & Julio de Santa Ana "Stating the Problem" (pp. 3-16) & "The Modern Roots of Economic Globalization" (pp.91-124) in Julio de Santa Ana et al **Beyond Idealism: a Way Ahead for Ecumenical Social Ethics** Eerdmans Grand Rapids 2006

_____ & Julio de Santa Ana "Globalization and Modernity" in Ninan Koshy **Globalization : the Imperial Thrust of Modernity** Vikas Adyayan Kendra Mumbai 2002 pp. 1-32

Bob Goudzwaard's writings can be found at the All of Life Redeemed site <http://allofliferedeemed.co.uk/goudzwaard.htm> maintained by Steve Bishop in Bristol, England.

Julio de Santa Ana **Good News to the Poor: the Challenge of the Poor in the History of the Church** WCC Geneva 1977

Abraham Kuyper **The Problem of Poverty** edited by James W Skillen. A translation of the opening address at the First Christian Social Congress in the Netherlands, November 9, 1891 Baker Grand Rapids 1991

Dietrich Bonhoeffer **Discipleship** Fortress Press Mn 2003

David Koyzis **Political Visions and Illusions** IVP Downers Grove 2003

Herman Dooyeweerd **Roots of Western Culture: Pagan, Secular and Christian Options** Wedge Toronto 1979

- Alan Storkey **Jesus and Politics: Confronting the Powers** Baker
Grand Rapids 2005
- _____ **Foundational Epistemologies in Consumption Theory**
PhD Proefschrift, Vrije Universiteit Pers 2003
- James W Skillen **With or Against the World? America's Role Among
the Nations** Rowman and Littlefield Lanham 2005
- _____ **In Pursuit of Justice: Christian Democratic
Explorations** Rowman and Littlefield Lanham 2004
- _____ **A Covenant to Keep: Meditations on the Biblical
Theme of Justice** CRC Publications, Grand Rapids 2000
- Pacific Conference of Churches **The Island of Hope: an Alternative to
Economic Globalization, Dossier No. 7** Available at;
[http://www.oikoumene.org/fileadmin/files/wcc-
main/documents/p3/dossier-7.pdf](http://www.oikoumene.org/fileadmin/files/wcc-main/documents/p3/dossier-7.pdf)
- George Williams, Graham Leung, Anthony J Regan, Jon Fraenkel (March
4th 2009) "Courts and Coups in Fiji: the 2008 High Court
Judgment in Qarase v Bainimarama" **State, Society and
Governance in Melanesia** Discussion Paper 2008/10,
Research School of Pacific and Asian Studies, ANU,
Canberra,
<http://rspas.anu.edu.au/melanesia.discussion.php>

NOTE FOR FURTHER RESEARCH (BCW 16.3.2010): See also other articles and court judgements that are publicly available on the web that relate to the subsequent judgment by the Fiji High Court which found in favour of Qarase and therefore ruled that the coup had been illegal. This then prompted the military's Good Friday 2009 Coup and Fiji has been explicitly ruled by the Military ever since. The issue is not only about the role of the RFMF within Fijian society but also about the fact that the RFMF, under its present structure and leadership, has now effectively accepted that it is not to be included in the evolving security system of the South West Pacific. Hence its frantic hold on power has everything to do with the fact that its soldiers are without the career path that was expected of members of Fiji's military after independence. This is the historical situation that any Christian effort to nurture *regional* justice cannot avoid.