

# **MORAL REGENERATION MOVEMENT**

## **REPORT BY : COUNCILLOR COLIN FIBIGER – NELSON MANDELA METRO**

By invitation and nomination by the Nelson Mandela Metropolitan Council, I attended, the second of the Moral Regeneration Workshops, as well as the launch of the Moral Regeneration Movement in Waterkloof.

My overall opinion is one of disappointment, both at a perceived lack of genuine concern for the restoration of moral fibre in society, as well as the blatant additional agenda of restoring an “African Spirituality”, which is no more than an attempt, at bringing about a new “one world religion” which lacks any depth or level of conviction.

This of course in line with UNESCO and other UN initiatives to reduce the impact of Christianity on society and blends well with Minister Kadar Asmal’s education department’s attempts of introducing “sameness of religion” in our schools.

### **2<sup>ND</sup> MORAL REGENERATION WORKSHOP - JOHANNESBURG**

This workshop was hosted by the Johannesburg municipality and attended by the original drivers of the programme as well as new invited members of the public. Attendance was poor and dominated by certain segments of society, due to a limited invitation list. The overwhelming majority of attendees, consisted of ANC/COSATU/SACP members and a supposed “Christian” representation, made up of SACC members.

Comments and discussion were therefore one sided and did not contribute to broadening the spectrum of discussion and input.

A marked distinction of discussion, was the aversion and sometimes definite refusal to discuss what in fact morals actually were, which is in my view is a clear indication that morals were indeed not the issue. Unfortunately, this process is driven by government and conflicting messages are therefore going to go out to the public, thereby limiting their perception of legitimate intention and of course their participation.

Christians across South Africa, still remember Minister Asmal attacking the Church for coming together at Newlands to pray for transformation in our nation. Now this same government is calling for these Christians to partake in transformation.

In his opening address at this second workshop, Deputy President Zuma decried the levels of violence and sex on our television programmes. Most are bemusedly wondering if he knows that he assisted to bring about the legislation that made this possible.

Much of the discussion revolved around historical blame, the effects of a lack of morality, implementation of programmes, and the fact that we were dealing with what is termed “relative morality.” In short, this is no more than a morality, which is designed for compromise, can change constantly with the needs and standards of society and allows for any form of behaviour depending on circumstance. e.g. It is not immoral to steal if you are hungry. It is not immoral to murder if historical circumstance pushed you in that direction.

Attached hereto, is an annexure titled Zinkeldoks and Morality, summarising a brief input that I made regarding the necessity for us to define in clear terms the basis of morality.

## MRM LAUNCH – WATERKLOOF

Delegates from across the country attended the official launch of the MRM, but once again, representation was limited in its accessing the broader community of South Africans. It quickly became clear that the government had nothing to say, other than that they intended promoting their own value system – the constitution. It is obvious that the exclusion of Almighty God in the constitution is a practice they wish to extend to all spheres of culture.

A variety of speakers, spoke around a common theme of inherited lack of morality due to the apartheid legacy, as well as other indicators such as the South African GINI factor, which is the highest in the world. The overwhelming spirit was one of animism and evolutionism, with a common solution – fix the environment and you fix the man. This refutes scripture, in that all man is fallen and can only be redeemed, both in the flesh and in the spirit, through Christ.

Cedric Mason, of the SACC, summarised this viewpoint, saying, “Our problem is our economic system. It condemns the majority to abject poverty.” One can only assume he is punting socialist/communist economic preferences and it is sad that a platform for morals should be used to discuss his political preferences.

Deputy President Zuma provided the meeting with similar contradiction as at the second MR Workshop complaining for instance that parents are losing control of their children, while he merrily supported the removal of corporal punishment, as well as a reduced role of parents in their children’s education. He also gave the same “TV is corrupting our Youth” speech while failing to make a positive statement about amending the laws that make such corruption possible. It is mixed messages such as this that possibly do the most damage to the moral fabric of South Africa, when our leaders, say one thing and do another, justifying it always with fancy words such as freedom of speech etc.

A mock “debate” was held between Bishop Darling (of the Catholic Church), a Hindu advocate and Blade Nzimande (an atheist/communist). The audience then had to endure listening to puppet speeches of “we all serve one god, god has many names.” That they did not put a real Christian on stage reflects their total disrespect for the majority of South Africans and also makes clear their own agenda.

Although it was made clear, that this was not a forum to discuss religion, an international “Ba’hai” dance group were brought in to entertain the delegates and were also allowed to distribute their materials on the tables provided for MRM papers. This act in itself, is immoral, discriminatory and indicates the level of commitment to morality, I believe we will see emerging from this. Just to make sure everyone got the message, a young lady then sang a song about how terrible the Christian Church treated her because she had AIDS. The overall emerging message was clear. Get out of Christianity and join us in our new “one god for all” philosophy.

Dr Brenda Lieberwitz reported on how the new curriculum will be used to promote tolerance and to promote values. Having perused the Curriculum 2005 documents, this too is objectionable, as the values and tolerance they wish to indoctrinate our children with is completely unbiblical and therefore offensive to the majority. How it is envisaged to build up morality by breaking down the morality of Christianity is inconceivable.

### Provincial Group Discussions

I attempted to make a positive input, but once it was clear that I was coming from a Biblical viewpoint, my voice was quickly avoided. My proposal to adhere to Biblical values was first ignored and then changed to “religious values”

My objection to this alteration was shot down saying that this was not a religious forum. Close to us however, in the National Group Discussion, Prof Ntuli spoke about the equilibrium between spirit and nature, and sang a praise song to Jacob Zuma. Machilo Motsehi, a lady from the African Renaissance

Chapter made it clear that she was not alone, but had been accompanied by her ancestors. Dual standards such as this were the norm of the day and is indicative of our fast failing democracy and transparency. The message of the day was clear – come with any viewpoint, from any perspective, but do not do so from a true Christian viewpoint.

## **THE WORKSHOP REPORTS**

Although the MRM launch was largely without teeth and very few guidelines were given that provided clear direction, a lot more can be derived from the report which was issued on workshops I & II. Directed by the same persons who are now steering the MRM nationally, a clearer picture is obtainable on the agenda and motivation for the MRM.

### Foreword by Deputy President Zuma

This only reflects the favouritism of the ruling party to anyone who simply nods their heads in agreement but it is pertinent to note that when we are discussing a way forward for morality, Mr Zuma chooses to single out ‘Liberation Theologians’ (whatever these are in scriptural terms?), as having spoken out against apartheid and declared it a sin. This kind of bias should have no place in a document supposing to as he states in his opening paragraph, ‘reach the entire spectrum of our society’.

A lesson well learnt here is that those who have no concept of Christianity should rather refrain from commenting on the dynamics thereof. It is not man who declares something a sin, but God. It would indeed be enlightening if Mr Zuma praised God for declaring racialism a sin thousands of years ago.

### Preamble

The document (no doubt purely because of the nature of those invited to the workshops), claims that although all are concerned about morality it is only the ANC that took the initiative toward action. Once again, the ANC has proved that it cannot address issues within their context but must abuse such a forum for politicizing. One must ask how moral such actions are and how they contribute to morality.

The initial workshops by admission, did not aim at defining morality per se and chose rather to plant the roots of compromise from the beginning. If morality was a struggle in the context of our past, these workshops must surely be condemned as ‘impimpi’, as sell outs. A condition is set, this early in the document, that morality, has nothing to do with ‘piestic values’, such as premarital sex etc. How these so-called leaders can speak on behalf of a Christian majority in this country and discount their values as irrelevant is both arrogant and damaging to the process.

The statement they are making to the Christian population is this, ‘Please come on board, but first admit that you are wrong, or at best outdated’

### I Nature & Extent of the Problem

The third paragraph of this section attempts to deal with the historical background to immorality in SA and fails to recognise that our diverse peoples have a history that extends beyond the years of apartheid. They further insult the intelligence of the reader by placing the issue of apartheid under the heading of colonialism. It is this short period of our history the document then claims, is to blame for all our woes and lack of morality. This humanist attitude of simply placing blame without recognising man’s responsibility before God and his fellow man must be rooted out if we are in way, going to address the issue or morality with any measure of success.

What this attitude also fails to address, is the very heading of the report namely ‘Freedom & Responsibility’. Our nation needs to become responsible for it’s actions and not to seek exoneration through circumstance and censure of others such as in a paragraph where a ridiculous allegation is made that serious crime was brought in by immigrants.

Statements such as these are not designed to build morality but to entrench racism and xenophobia. The claim to not have judged, as a workshop is meaningless – words, once said, go their way and impart destruction.

Interesting to note is the notion that a manifestation of morality lack is what is termed ‘perverted religious beliefs’. Upon attempting to ascertain the meaning of this I was initially answered that it dealt with issues such as the accepted racism in the Church. I then questioned whether ministers who condoned abortion, voted in favour of a Party that legalized pornography etc, would be categorized within this ‘perverted belief’.

I still do not have a clear answer on this. From my present understanding it would on a whole apply to anyone fundamentalist and unwilling to compromise the truth. This I can only assume would include any committed Christian unwilling to compromise the Word of God. Into this, read that anyone who will accept the “one god, many names” concept is accepted and all the others are perverted.

### *Attitudes of Political & Religious Sectors*

This section continues with it’s attack, claiming that the Church has taken the back seat with regard to morality, instead of taking the initiative. It speaks of everyone wanting to be in power, but not using that power to instill values, and of not practicing what they preach. Here it cites the Body of Christ of preaching fellowship but not putting this into practice.

This horribly biased and distorted view has to be condemned in the strongest possible terms. It is indeed government who continually criticizes the Church for their emphasis on morality. Has it been the Church who legalized pornography to it’s current extent? Has it been the Church who legitimized homosexual relationships? Is it the Church investigating legalizing “soft drugs”? Is it not the Church that has been lambasted for standing against current abortion murders? Is it the Church or government embarking on a condomise campaign amongst innocent children?

Perhaps the real allegation here is that the Church does not support this new perverted form of morality.

## II Freedom and Obligation

### *Obligations of Freedom*

The agenda of the MRM becomes clearer in this section, and calls are made for Africans to recover the long lost religio-socio-economic values by which pre-colonial communities of this continent lived. Interesting to note that the hired “Christians” support this return to other religions and the new catch phrase, ‘Ubuntu’.

The mindset indoctrination continues it’s flow, claiming that for instance, xenophobia, is a “western” point of departure and very un-African. This kind of generalization is both insulting and inflammatory and fails to address questions such as why for instance, in South Africa, attacks on foreigners are ongoing, whereas they are isolated in western countries.

If there is any obligation under freedom, it is the responsibility to accept blame, both as individuals and collectively, and the MRM has failed dismally in this regard, having chosen rather to place the blame anywhere else but at home.

## *Religious Sector*

Criticism is leveled in this section, for the religious sector exchanging an African spirituality for a foreign one. It is a constitutional right of the peoples of South Africa to choose their religion and to even consider being accusatory about the fact that over 70% of this country is Christian, and thereby belonging to a foreign religion, is both unconstitutional as well as extremely short sighted.

These “foreign” religions are blamed for anything from greed, dishonesty and lack of work ethic to individualism and materialism. These statements border perilously close to hate speech and infringement of freedom of religion. The criticism regarding materialism is an obvious effort to convince the nation of the need for a move to a socialist/communist dispensation and once again, it is immoral to use such a forum for politicking.

These leaders of the MRM have willfully chosen to ignore the fact the Africa was indeed the very first place to hear the Gospel outside of Israel and therefore that Christianity is 2000 years old on the continent. How this is construed then as “foreign” is beyond the understanding of anyone sincerely seeking truth.

The workshop supposes to dictate to the Church it’s role in the country’s future and calls for amongst others, a) *Lessening guilt preaching*. The double mindedness is quite obvious here, and in other words, the Church has to stop speaking on it’s form of morality b) *Resuscitating African spirituality and disseminating this through education, liturgy and the media*. This is a blatant call upon the Church to forsake Christ and follow other religions. The fact that state funding is paying for the MRM makes such promotion of a particular religion unconstitutional. Evidence of this process is already in place with the abuse of many Christian pulpits and we have seen Curriculum 2005’s contribution to the multi faith movement. c) *Questioning any morally baseless faith*. One can only assume based on content of this document that this faith would include Christianity for it’s stand against the ‘right’ of a child to have an abortion, or for it’s support of a free market economy.

What is indeed happening here is that government is raising up the MRM as a voice to either approve or condemn religions it wishes to raise up or destroy.

## *Private and Public Sector*

The claim is made that government is the “overarching custodian” of the nations morality. This is to be seen in the light of a statement made in a previous section whereby the Church is called upon to acknowledge that it has failed in this regard. If this is indeed so, then why the aversion to defining morality specifically? If the government and the MRM wish to have this authority, then they have to also accept the responsibility. The contents of this workshop document clearly reflect that there is no such acceptance of responsibility and therefore support should rather be given to those who have the courage and conviction to address this issue.

## **CONCLUSION**

There is consensus that society is falling apart due to the absolute lack of morality. As a result, the freedoms fought for in this country have fallen apart alongside them.

The government and the MRM have clearly spelt out the intention to NOT provide the guidance for defining morality, and thereby perpetuates the framework of “relative morality” which in effect removes responsibility from society, creates individualism and a morality that is self determined and therefore self seeking.

One has to question the motivations of individuals when a problem is acknowledged but no real tangible solutions are proposed or accepted. It is common knowledge that the destabilization of society is a tool used to manipulate the collective and thereby bring about new indoctrinated mindsets and dispensations. The question then remains unanswered. Are South African citizens paying the price for the idealism of a few who choose to allow us to suffer, the havoc to continue, so that they at the height of the crisis, may present a model for a brave new world? A shocking concept in a modern world but one that deserves thought in the light of the facts before us.

The agenda of the “drivers” of the MRM regarding the removal of “foreign” religions and the promotion of “African” spirituality has been made abundantly clear. While they have the full right to do so in their personal capacity, it infringes upon constitutional rights and basic morality to use state funds and organisations for this purpose. If the reverse statement was made, and Christianity designated as the way forward, the full might of legislature including these supposed custodian of morality would of come down on the MRM and branded it as fundamentalist.

That no-one has said a word about the undisguised promotion of a specific religion indicates only that this intention is known and condoned by those in authority. This immorality in itself, condemns the movement to failure. Not as a political tool for which it appears to be intended, but definitely as a tool for the restoration of morals.

The MRM is a political tool, designed to convince segments of the population that the present government is indeed concerned about their morality and as a result, their well being and secondly a means of promoting a specific religion.

Both of these should be driven by the respective groupings, by means of their own funding, and not using the resources, time and money for which the tax payer has paid.

### **ZINKELDOKS AND MORALITY**

An abbreviated version of input made at 2<sup>nd</sup> Moral Regeneration Workshop, by ACDP Councillor, Colin Fibiger, of the Nelson Mandela Metropole.

(A Zinkeldok, is an imaginary loaf of bread, that does not actually exist which was “baked” up for the purposes of making the point.)

CF - Colin Fibiger

AM - Attending Members

CF Does anybody here no how to bake a Zinkeldok?

(Blank faces and silence. Eventually.....)

AM What on earth is a Zinkeldok?

CF It is a loaf of bread. Does anybody know how to bake one?

AM No idea. Never heard of it.

CF It is a fairly flat loaf. Lots of seeds in it. Normally baked in a clay oven outside, on a slow heat. Nobody know how to make one?

AM No.

CF Without Zinkeldoks, peoples diets are depleted of very necessary vitamins, minerals and other essential nutrients necessary for healthy living. Large segments of society are suffering tremendously, just because they do not have Zinkeldoks.

Historically, Zinkeldoks were very popular and widespread, but due to varying prices of flour, some segments of society got less and less and the leaders of this group decided that if they couldn't have, then nobody should have.

Today, the result is, that Zinkeldoks are rare and those that bake them are even criticized for doing so. Despite the fact that Zinkeldoks are healthy, most members of society have been convinced, through marketing that in fact it is not necessary to have Zinkeldoks.

The sad thing is, is not everyone suffers. Even those that fought against Zinkeldoks are now understanding that no diet is complete without them.

The answer of course is to have a workshop on baking Zinkeldoks. We will have to do it in a way though that doesn't offend those that don't like Zinkeldoks. We will also have to devise programmes that involve the whole populace.

Now that I have told you all this, is there anyone who can bake me a Zinkeldok?

AM You haven't told us enough.

CF I could go on and on discussing the implication of not having Zinkeldoks, how we are going to make them available, and discuss the historical blame for their not being baked any more. We could enter into long discourse on future programmes etc, but unless I get to the nitty gritty, and give you the actual recipe, I will not have done anything for you, and when we leave here, still none of you will be able to bake a Zinkeldok.

Without a list of essential ingredients you will not be able to move forward.

The same applies to us addressing the issue of morality. Someone must have the courage to give a list of morals. Someone must show they are capable of leading and not be afraid of offending criminals, pornography mongers, and murderers through abortion.

We can discuss legacies of the past and their impact on morality, we can debate future programmes for the return of morality and we can assess the damage done by the lack thereof, but we will no take one step forward until someone stands up and tells the nation exactly what morality is.

The term thrown around here today, “relative morality”, is a joke. Mor ality is an absolute. It cannot be debated. As any change in a recipe no longer gives you an intended product, any change

to the ingredients of morality will not bring about the change you say you seek. Whether all present here accept it or not, the Bible still remains our only true source of direction in this regard.

By your own definition, you are saying, that you would accept cannibalism if a majority of the population deemed it normal or if circumstance justified it.

AM (Interjecting) You are being extreme. We would obviously not go that far!

CF This is true. What you are then saying is, is that you personally will become the guardians of morality in the future. That you have the capacity to decide what is right or wrong, and furthermore, that you have better judgment than God. This is absolute idolatry and no more than man's typical nature of wanting to elevate himself to demigod status.

I close with this. In order to go forward, we must define what morality is. As an absolute. Those of you who call yourselves Christians, have no option but to accept God's Word as that absolute.