

Input on Defence Act:

A24.3.3

passed to 1983
present legislation.

Defence Act of 1957:

legislation relating to mil. service is contained in Defence Act
no. 44 of 1957.

Group of 23:

Diverse group & diff. options being contemplated by the 23

- imprisoned.
- recog. P.O's.
- exile
- not actually forcing issue now.

Spontaneous grapevine

A way of stating their opposition to SADF.
> no. of pp. saying no to SADF but Def. Act. of 1983 has curtailed that.

Response from military; slightly reticent & just spelt out.

Initiatives:

Press Conf. launched

Public mtg.

Statement taken to Castle - investigating under Sect 121(c) -
now been withdrawn.

Breakdown of the 23:

- 1 community service
- 1 reserve
- 21 face near call ups / distant future.
- ↑ 6 done initial 2 yrs.

Questions:

1. Do we support changes to the Defence Act.
- as given in ASC
2. Do churches need to work in united action to win support for changes - realized by gov. to effect those changes.
3. Is there support for the particular way in which the ASC has envisaged taking forward this demand.
- is it opportune to take up this project.
- 4.

Plenary discussion:

Need to involve Jewish community

Details of campaign:

a) Strengths

Strengths:

- things only move when there's action on behalf of pp.
- strength will depend on support we get from the churches.
- potential to mobilize those who are affected by the syst. of mil. service.
- symbolic action & significance of it
- united church support
- asking for traditional pos. of churches to be recognised - i.e. on just war situation.
- putting into practise what we're saying - genuinely patriotic - symbolic demonstration of genuineness of our position.
- theological argument posited to recognize that are inalienable god-given rights.
- move from resolution politics to practical implementation.
- it's opportune.
- educational process & generate lots of Q's & raise awareness of role of army.
- strong basis in biblical theology & natural principles of justice.

Weakness

- confrontational nature & CD component may be potentially difficult & ∴
tone of movement is NB
→ this is the reality - should we actively disobey
- can it maintain level of grassroots support.
- acceptance from the grassroots level will be hard
- co-ordination problems \leftarrow inds. who don't rep. the church.
 \leftarrow bureaucracy
- danger of it becoming highly politicised \leftarrow task of church.
- conscripts duty to military & recog. that church. progr. not exempt from the mil.
- insufficient clarity on who will be volunteers for this progr \leftarrow like composite to 23.
- make clear to black community that taking up needs of conscriptees of

New Ideas:

- Jewish community / Afr. churches / Brethren / Muslims.
- Peace projects run by church - solidarity & symbolic act.
- 2 stage plan \leftarrow combined approach of 3 demands made to govt. } official rep. from each church & put forward predicament.
 \leftarrow then go ahead with the plan
- pamphlet / kit on alt. service programme guidelines for discussion. \Rightarrow make alt. service available to them.

Strengths:

- church able to offer C.O.'s. other option - church needs to go to people.
- incorporates all C.O.'s & ∴ strengthen
- meeting the needs of conscripts right now.
- can draw a support even of those who aren't opposed to conscription ~~per se~~.
- needs united church action to succeed.

Weakness:

- objection to language used
- panel not acceptable - need to recog. right of conscript
- practical prob. of having to set up board of pp. for 12/12.
- ensure that govt. will never recognize what we want to say if his scheme is successful.

Need clearer idea of programme of action to take forward ideas of broad peace goals.

Weakness:

Panel : needs more specific critique

Rank & file churchgoers may not support it.

Not solve military obligations of the conscript - Need to ensure disciplinary procedures.

To involve 7 & black pp. also - how to broaden it.

Strength:

- Help to bring together those who are on their own & wanting to object.
- If church behind them then can find a place to express their opposition to the SADF.
- Communication with the state & how to raise it with them.
- Advice bureaux could be strengthened - more resources & finances channelled.
- Need to canvass with young pp. what their feelings are on this.

Ideas:

Survey of young pp.'s: ideas thru' youth groups etc.

Strengths:

- concrete & can be seen.
- follows on logically from what church has been saying.
- it's a plausible request / not too radical
- publicity would be positive - media

Weakness

- greater clarity on how to place c.o.'s into jobs & alt. comm. service.
- respected pp- on panel & to assoc.
- what no. of churches will support this??
- finances - salary of the c.o.'s.
- what if no's. so phenomenal that can't cope w it.

Discussion on principles of the panel:

- what's aim of panel
- what does it judge & discuss.

Steering Committee:

Bria Deal
Sheena Duncan
Paul Vemyr
Archbishop Daniel.
Jacqui Baulte
Steve Lowry.
Noel Stott

Collection Number: AG1977

END CONSCRIPTION CAMPAIGN (ECC)

PUBLISHER:

Publisher:- Historical Papers Research Archive

Location:- Johannesburg

©2013

LEGAL NOTICES:

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

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

People using these records relating to the archives of Historical Papers, The Library, University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, are reminded that such records sometimes contain material which is uncorroborated, inaccurate, distorted or untrue. While these digital records are true facsimiles of paper documents and the information contained herein is obtained from sources believed to be accurate and reliable, Historical Papers, University of the Witwatersrand has not independently verified their content. Consequently, the University is not responsible for any errors or omissions and excludes any and all liability for any errors in or omissions from the information on the website or any related information on third party websites accessible from this website.

This document is part of a collection held at the Historical Papers Research Archive at The University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, South Africa.