

CONSTITUTIONAL COMPROMISES ARE ROOTED IN REALITY

"Good constitutions are always the end result of a series of delicate compromises rooted in the reality of the here and now. Zimbabwe Rhodesia's black leaders were consulted on each provision of the constitution. They gave their approval after hard bargaining. They agreed to the 28-seat provision because they knew that most whites would not stay without such a guarantee. They further knew that, without European managerial and technical expertise, Zimbabwe Rhodesia's economic future would be bleak—which is precisely the case with its neighbors, Angola, Mozambique and Zaire, which offered no such assurances to their white minorities.

Pure theory is often compromised in order to preserve more important goals—for example, the survival of a nation and, in this case, any future hope in Zimbabwe Rhodesia for a majoritarian democracy. The denial of recognition for Muzorewa's government means that a near-democratic regime may not survive long enough to improve its form of government. We in the United States had more than a century to make a more perfect union; the Zimbabwe Rhodesians are asking for a decade.

"Zimbabwe Rhodesia may not survive, because it is challenged by men who are not enthusiastic about democracy in any known form. Robert Mugabe, the Mozambique-based guerrilla leader, openly proclaims his devotion to Marxism. Joshua Nkomo, operating from Zambia, publicly scorns electoral democracy.

"Moral principle is vital to American foreign policy. But it must be applied consistently, and with great care for the consequences. It must meet the test of choosing the good when the best is not possible. Zimbabwe Rhodesia provides a classic example of such a choice."

-Stefan A. Halper and Roger W. Fontaine, writing in the LOS ANGELES TIMES, July 16, 1979-
(Halper & Fontaine are senior associates of the Center for Strategic & International Studies in Washington, D.C.)

Rhodesians Worldwide

"One of the more depressing ironies of the President's decision to continue the sanctions against Zimbabwe Rhodesia is that it undermines a pro-Western, democratically elected, multi-party government in a situation where the sole realistic alternative is a pro-Soviet black dictatorship. And if that is not disconcerting enough, Carter asks us to believe that his policy represents 'in international affairs what our nation stands for, what our people believe in'."

-Carl Gershman, writing in the NEW LEADER, June 18, 1979-
(Gershman is the Executive Director of Social Democrats, U.S.A.)

POLITICAL ACTIVISM BY WORLD COUNCIL OF CHURCHES

ANALYTICAL STUDY BY PROFESSOR LEFEVER

IN AMSTERDAM TO NAIROBI: THE WORLD COUNCIL OF CHURCHES AND THE THIRD WORLD PROFESSOR ERNEST LEFEVER TRACES THE MOVEMENT OF THE WCC "FROM A LARGELY WESTERN DEMOCRATIC CONCEPT OF POLITICAL RESPONSIBILITY TO A MORE RADICAL IDEOLOGY THAT BY 1975 EMBRACED THE CONCEPT AND PRACTICE OF LIBERATION THEOLOGY," WHICH "BEARS A STRIKING RESEMBLANCE TO MARXISM." LEFEVER DISCUSSES IN HIS BOOK THE 1978 WCC GRANT TO THE PATRIOTIC FRONT GUERRILLAS SEEKING TO OVERTHROW RHODESIA'S INTERRACIAL GOVERNMENT.

In a foreword George F. Will writes that "readers of Professor Lefever's essay can decide for themselves the extent to which bad sociology, bad theology, bad faith and, yes, sin feed on one another and are to blame for what the WCC has been doing."

The book is published by the Ethics and Public Policy Center of Georgetown University, of which Professor Lefever is the founding director.

-o-o-o-

AMSTERDAM TO NAIROBI: THE WORLD COUNCIL OF CHURCHES AND THE THIRD WORLD. \$5 paperback.
\$10 hardback. Ethics and Public Policy Center, 1211 Connecticut Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C.
20036.