

PRO

VERITATE

INHOUD/CONTENTS

The Sound of the Trumpet	1
'n Verhelderende Siening van Liberalisme	1
Editorial/Inleidingsartikel	5
What is a Hebrew Christian?	6
Giva a Dog a Bad Name	8
Die Kerk Buite Suid-Afrika	11
Readers' Views	10, 13
Book Review/Boekbespreking	14
International standard urged to guarantee religious liberty	16

CHRISTELIKE MAANDBLAD VIR SUIDELIKE AFRIKA—CHRISTIAN MONTHLY FOR SOUTHERN AFRICA

September 15 September 1965

Jaargang IV, Nr. 5

5c

Intekengeld R1 Subscription

Volume IV, No. 5

By die Hoofposkantoor as Nuusblad geregistreer.

Registered at the Post Office as a Newspaper.

THE SOUND OF THE TRUMPET

I stationed watchmen over you, saying
"Give heed to the sound of the trumpet!"

(Jeremiah 6:17)

It is now a full generation ago that Harry Emerson Fosdick delivered the Lyman Beecher lectures at Yale Divinity School on *The Modern Use of the Bible*. The lecture which elicited the greatest response at the time bore the title "Abiding Experiences in Changing Categories." It is not too much to say that this note was sounded in all of Dr. Fosdick's preaching from this pulpit. He was always intent upon distinguishing the transient from the permanent, the things that pass with the day from the things that outlast the years, the ephemeral words of the particular hour from the Word of God that stands forever.

If in our broken times we are less confident about the abiding experiences and make much less of them than Dr. Fosdick, the changing categories of which he spoke have become the major pre-occupation of our age. The word **change** is writ large in our lexicon of living. It is stamped upon every manifestation of our culture: drama, fiction, poetry, art, and music. It is reflected in the way we think or try to think. It is lodged deep in the modern mood. Our language suffers from strain and fatigue, and therefore from an indiscriminating prolixity. Our words have become shopworn precisely at a time when we have come to recognize the life that words have in the lives we live together. So it should occasion no surprise that we should search, whether we be secular men or religious men, for some symbol, some metaphor, some myth or allegory which will give expression, on the one hand, to the inchoateness and distraction of modern existence, and, on the other, to the possibilities of the emerging new.

Some years ago, Elmer Davis,

in reviewing Reinhold Niebuhr's **Reflections on the End of an Era**, made an urgent appeal to his contemporaries to compose a modern apocalypse, a work which would comprehend within its vast vistas the confusions and demonologies

of our world. That apocalypse remains to be written. We have no Daniel addressing himself to his stricken age, no seer on the island of Patmos, nor, indeed, a Joachim of Floris or Dante or Dostoievski. William Wordsworth, in an age of revolution, could write, "O Milton, thou shouldst be living at this hour. England hath need of thee." But it is not a Milton that we need so much today, but a prophet, a prophet and a poet like Jeremiah, who spoke to an era that was ending in the ancient world. And

(Please turn page over)

'N VERHELDERENDE SIENING VAN LIBERALISME!

So lank is dit nou al dat 'n mens begeer en bid dat daar tog 'n einde mag kom aan die babelse verwarring wat daar bestaan in verband met die sogenaamde „gevaar van liberalisme", en dat daar tog verantwoordelike persone na vore mag kom wat in plek van net vaag na hierdie „gevaar" te verwys, dit tog duidelik en prinsipiëel sal omlin. 'n Mens het al so moeg geword van al die onverantwoordelike geskree en geskel in hierdie verband!

Wat was dit nie 'n aangename verrassing en verkwikking toe Prof. F. J. M. Potgieter van Stellenbosch by geleentheid van die konferensie van die Vereniging vir Christelik Hoër Onderwys op Saterdag 21 Augustus 1965 in die Goudstadse Onderwyskollege hierdie onderwerp aangedurf het, en toe nie in vaaghede verval en

tot geskel oorgegaan het nie, maar pragtige prinsipiële grondlyne getrek het in verband met die verskynsel van liberalisme. Dit was 'n heerlike verrassing want in die lig van die feit dat die woord liberalisme by talle (meeste?) sprekers alleen die betekenis blyk te hê dat jy daarmee ander

(Blaai om asb.)

'n Verhelderende siening van Liberalisme!

(Vervolg van bladsy 1)

wat nie geheel met jou saamstem of in alles presies konformeer nie, onder verdenking bring, het 'n mens eintlik gevoel dat jy al byvoorbaat weet wat gesê gaan word toe die strooibiljette mense na die byeenkoms genooi het met die kreet: „Ons christelike vryheid word deur die liberalisme bedreig!” Maar hier is nie gesê wat ons op grond van al die teleurstellende en ontstellende ervarings te wagte was nie. Inteendeel, hier is 'n totaal ander geluid gehoor. Prof. Potgieter het liberalisme beskryf as „die rigting waar in plek van dat God in die sentrum staan, die mens in die sentrum gestel word.” Hierop het hy uitgebrei en telkens herhaal dat die liberalisme die stelsel is waardeur die menslike gesag en vryheid beklemtoon word ten koste van en bó die gesag van God en die vryheid wat alleen in Christus is. Hy sien die liberalis as die mens wat vergeet dat die menslike rede verdorwe is en dit tot die hoogste kernbron verhel.

Die hele tyd tydens Prof. Potgieter se referaat is 'n mens beïndruk deur die feit dat hier iemand aan die woord is wat aedink en aestudeer het. Die liberalisme sien hy as 'n bedreiging vir ons christelike vryheid in dié sin dat die liberalis wat die mens in die sentrum plaas, onverdraagsaam is teenoor die ortodoksie wat God en Gods Woord alléén sentraal stel. In die lig van hierdie siening kan 'n mens begryp dat ons mense moet opgeroep word om die stryd aan te knoop teen 'n vyand wat verwoesting saai in die kerk, politiek en gesin — 'n vyand wat dan inderdaad gesien moet word as die wegbereider van die Kommunisme. Terwyl die spreker aan die woord was, het 'n mens spontaan gedink aan die werking van die liberalistiese gees onder ons kerkmense wat so bevreesd is dat hulle beleid aangevaak sal word, en wat veral tans soveel blyke gee van die feit dat God se gesag en God se Woord nie meer vir hulle die hoogste is nie, maar dat die beleid, die tradisie, die volkswil, ens. hulle meer aanspreek. Hierdie onverdraagsaamheid van die liberalis teen-

oor die ortodoksie wat pleit vir die Woord van God as hoogste gesag, word deur talle Christene in Suid-Afrika aan die lyf gevoel. En tog eienaardig — die onverdraagsaamheid teenoor die beklemtoning van die gesag van Gods Woord, word heel dikwels betoon juis deur hulle wat die meeste te sé het oor die gevaar van liberalisme. Prof. Potgieter het pragtig aangedui wie die ware liberaliste is nl. nie hulle wat ég-christelik wil wees nie, maar hulle wat die menslike gedagte, beleid, vryheid, ens. só hoog aanslaan en onverdraagsaam is teenoor die christelike getuigenis. Uit hierdie referaat moet onvermydelik gekonkludeer word dat talle wat so skerp is in die sg. liberaliste-jaq, self niks anders as vermoede liberaliste is nie — liberaliste omdat dit vir hulle nie sentraal om die Woord van God gaan nie.

Die uiteensetting van Prof. Potgieter was vir ons werklik 'n riem onder die hart, en dit het by 'n mens die drang laat opkom om des te sterker te aetuig en te pleit en te stry dat Gods Woord die hoogste gesag sal wees — te getuig en te pleit en te stry teen die druk van die liberalisme waar Gods Woord uit die sentrum verdring word ter wille van die menslike gedagte, wil, beleid, ens.

(Ingestuur)

PRO VERITATE

Verskyn elke 15de van die maand.

Korrespondensie en Administrasie:

Alle briewe vir die redaksie en die administrasie aan:
Posbus 487, Johannesburg.

Redaksionele Bestuur:

Ds. A. W. Habelgaarn,
Ds. E. E. Mahabane,
Ds. A. L. Mncube,
Ds. J. E. Moulder,
Mnr. J. Oglethorpe,
Ds. R. Orr,
Prof. dr. A. van Selms.

Assistent-redakteur:

Dr. B. Engelbrecht,

Redakteur:

Ds. C. F. B. Naudé.

Intekengeld:

Republiek van Suid-Afrika, S.W.A., die Rhodesië en Protektorate:
R1 per jaar vooruitbetaalbaar.
Oorsee: R1.50 per jaar vooruitbetaalbaar.

Tjeks en posorders moet uitgemaak word aan „Pro Veritate” (Edms.) Bpk., Posbus 487, Johannesburg.

Gedruk deur Prompt Drukkers Maatskappy (Edms.) Bpk., Harrisstraat 11, Westgate, Johannesburg.

The sound of the trumpet

(Continued from page 1)

the symbol for Jeremiah is the trumpet: „Give heed to the sound of the trumpet!”

THE TRUMPETERS OF GOD

The trumpet is a good symbol. It is one of the major symbols of all Scripture. It was at the sound of the trumpet that the covenant words were first spoken to Israel on Mount Sinai, „I am the Lord your God!”, and the words keep ringing throughout the Bible. That is Israel's imperishable gift to the world. It is at the trumpet's blast that the end of time will be ushered in, when we shall all stand before the judgement seat of Christ. On every new year the trumpet is blown again and again, and a new time begins. It is a symbol for Easter morning. The prophets of Israel understand themselves as the trumpeters of God. In times of crisis and danger God puts the trumpet to the lips of his messengers, and from early times to late we hear them sounding forth from the turrets of history. They are the watchmen for God, they are on the alert for him and for man. They summon to attention, they sound the alarm, they make imperious claims, they awaken us from lethargy, they call us to the momentous, they compel us to confront the present and forbid us to retreat, they proclaim the Word of God over against all the attractive alternatives. They address themselves to where the hurt is grievous, to the wounds of the human heart. They are never sentimental or trivial or clever, and never commonplace or dull. They know what preaching means and they will not translate it into a facile nostrum or an entertaining homily.

Jeremiah proclaimed the Word of God in an age of falling empire, an age of rising peoples. The nations were forging alliances and holding international conferences. Once he met the ambassadors as they were leaving a plenary session and he had something to say that bears repeating in the chancelleries of the nations and in the state department, in the present international situation,

The sound of the trumpet

whether in Viet Nam or the Dominican Republic or Rhodesia or South Africa. He told them that they all stood before the bar of the same ultimate judgement.

He walked the bazaars as they buzzed with buying and selling; one word was on the lips of everyone — prosperity. He told the people that their religion was an illusion, and that they were fast becoming like the illusions they were pursuing. He told them that they were changing religions:

Has a nation changed its gods,
eventhough they are no gods
at all?

But my people have exchanged
their glory
for all that is useless.

He went farther.

He said the official leaders of religion never troubled to occupy themselves with the central event which made them the distinctive people they were meant by God to be. They never spoke of the liberating event which had made them forever free, free from every tyranny, free from every obsession with the self, because they had committed themselves to a God, who was present and active in history, yet never to be identified with it. They were translating historical revelation into psychological states of mind. They said "Yahweh" (everyone was saying it), but they meant Baal. They said covenant but they meant the nation. They said, "We are a chosen people," but they meant patriotism. They fled to the Temple to escape the approaching storm and kept repeating the pious formula, "The temple of the Lord the temple of the Lord, the temple of the Lord," but Jeremiah said God was destroying the temple in order to preserve faith. He told them they were digging cisterns, but the cisterns could hold no water because they were cracked.

He was denounced as traitor, and they called him "Terror-on-every-side." Yet this is the wonder of the man, that he who was the most subversive of all the prophets — subversive to the nation and to national security, subver-

sive to the optimists and the politicians, subversive to religion and conventional piety — was the one who, more than any other, made it possible for Israel to transcend the downfall of the state, the destruction of the Temple, and the end of its political history. For a generation he proclaimed a radical criticism upon all the relativities of history and upon the most cherished and most venerated of national and religious institutions.

But he went farther still.

He took his stand at the final frontier where God Himself became his maximum problem. "You have deceived me, and I was deceived," he cried, "you are a mirage! You are stronger than I, and you always prevail. My sermons get nowhere, and you do nothing. I have become a derision and a laughing stock a joke. I am going to stop thinking about you once for all, and I will speak no more in your name." But then he heard himself spoken to again, and the Word was like a blazing fire pent up in his bones and like a hammer that crushes the rocks into pieces; he reeled like a drunken man, and then went forth again to sound his trumpet, calling men to obedience and faith, to justice and righteousness, to a future for which they can hope, to a new covenant inscribed upon the mind and will when all men will know that they have been forgiven.

THE EVER-EMERGING NEW

It is extraordinary that so many of the concerns which disturb us today and confuse our theologies disturbed Jeremiah too. I suspect that many of you have been listening between the lines all the time that we have been speaking of Jeremiah. He knew that God was not at all what men were making him out to be or what he himself had supposed him to be. He knew what religion could be and indeed was, a colossal deception, a lie, as he never wearied of saying. He knew the fashionable gods of the hour were doomed. He knew all the perplexities of a world in radical dissolution. But he grasped firmly the nettle of God's revelation in history, and was tortured by its dilemmas even more than we are. Yet he would not substitute for it a religion which undermined history

and robbed it of social relevance, although the majority of the prophets were doing so. "I have dreamed, I have dreamed," they said. "That's just the trouble," said Jeremiah. He would not resolve historical revelation into the kind of existentialism which made history of no effect. His own psychological problems were hard enough to bear. But beyond all the seasons of change and revolution, he could see the emergence of the new, of a new time when the old would pass away, and all things would become new.

It is our burden to speak to our own times, and we must address ourselves to the issues and problems of our time as Jeremiah did to his. How often we have heard it! But we must speak a language and employ forms of thought that are intelligible to the men of our time and culture. The prophets of Israel did not hesitate to employ the secular forms of speech, and their words were alive and vivid; they were teeming with contemporary events, and were everlastingly concrete. This is not at all to say that we are to dispense with the sermon, but it is to say that we must compose it with greater versatility, that we must venture to be as imaginative as the prophets were. And in our services of worship we have much to learn from East Harlem Protestant Parish and from Lampman Chapel and from the informal gatherings of prayer and praise of scattered groups throughout the country. And we do well to remember the words of the gospel, "Without a parable spoke he not unto them."

We have been speaking of the tides of change which are engulfing the earth. It is our task to have done with every manner of parochialism and provincialism, and yet to preserve that which is cen-

(Please turn over)

LET WEL

Die redaksie van Pro Veritate verklaar dat hy nie verantwoordelik is vir menings en standpunte wat in enige ander artikel van hierdie blad verskyn as die inleidingsartikels en redaksionele verklarings nie.

The sound of the trumpet

(Continued from page 3)

tral and distinctive in our tradition. We must be open to our times, open to the future, open to new thoughts and new theologies, open to Judaism and Catholicism, open even to other religions and listen to what they have to say, and it must be an honest dialogue and not exploitation.

Hebrew-Christian faith is able to bear this openness because it belongs to its very character to be open. Our faith is the history of the ever-emerging new, and faith becomes faith in a unique sense precisely because of the historical character of revelation. Otherwise we are substituting a security of our own devising. We are digging cisterns, and they hold no water. We must not expect to write a definite theology or a defensive Christology. It is very probable that we shall be saying it all quite differently a generation from now, as we said it quite differently a generation ago when Dr. Fosdick spoke of abiding experiences and changing categories.

We speak for the hour and to the hour. In the midst of change we witness to a changeless God, but we employ the formulations that are intelligible and congenial to our culture. We hold our treasure in earthen vessels. We speak these days of man come of age, and it may well be so, but we shall delude ourselves if we think that the men of the future will think in the same categories or speak the same words that we are using now. The horizons of God stretch infinitely beyond the ranges of our time. We are not the fools of Time. Time is not a whirligig. God's Word has been committed to the Church; it is there that His Voice still speaks, and it is the surest safeguard against the distortions and exaggerations of the present. Jesus Christ is present with us in this age, and he will be present in the ages to come. We who are called to be his watchmen will sound the trumpet and will summon men to faith and proclaim the good news or release from bondage and of salvation from every servitude of the heart.

THE KINGDOM OF OUR LORD

The Christ whom we preach is more than a mythical figure or a Gnostic redeemer. Myth there is indeed and necessarily so and always will be, but the myth is the precipitate of an historical life. We must affirm and must preach that the life that was lived on this earth was of a quality that could evoke the kind of response that the New Testament records report. It is not only **that** Jesus lived that is important for us but **how** he lived and how he died. Only so does he speak to our condition and to our great need. He dwelt among us. We have seen his glory. We have heard His Voice speaking. We meet him as one like ourselves. And the life that was lived was one of complete self-surrender, of compassion for our frailties, of a love so deep, so broad, so high that men could see in it a revelation of the love of God. It is in preaching that he is present and known. It is in the preached Word that we encounter Him as living Lord. And we who preach are summoned to commitment and decision. We do not preach ourselves — that would be of little avail. We preach Christ, a crucified Savior risen from the dead. We do not call men first of all to understand themselves, but to listen to One who understands and knows us altogether. So we think in faith, we live by faith, and we preach from faith.

We are speaking much these days about secular man. We meet him at the place of our social concerns and social action; we meet him at the gathering of the peoples; we meet him at the place of the travail and pain of the human heart, at the place where we speak to one another, at the place where the imagination is permitted to assert its claims and to survey the ranges of the universe. All of these are the places of Scripture, and let it never be forgotten. So we shall speak to each other and talk together about those things which concern us both most deeply. We shall "watch the dark fields for a rebirth of faith and wonder." We shall drink of fountains where fresh words are born, we shall travel on to the fields of light, and there will be spontaneous singing

then and praise and adoration. And upon some day, at the end of some road or some midnight of deep despairing, we shall listen together to the strange language of the apocalypse, for it is the secular brother who speaks of it in the councils of the nations or on the air waves or in the daily press, more than we who are ministers. So together we shall listen to the finale of trumpets sounding:

Then the seventh angel blew his trumpet, and there were loud voices in heaven saying, "The kingdom of the world has become the kingdom of our Lord and his Christ, and he shall reign for ever and ever." And the twenty-four elders who sit on their thrones before God fell on their faces and worshipped God, saying:

We give thanks to Thee, Lord God almighty, who art and wast, that Thou hast taken Thy great power and hast begun to reign.

The Rev. James Mullenburg is Professor Emeritus of Hebrew and Cognate Languages at Union Theological Seminary, New York. The above is an address delivered the Graduation Ceremony, Riverside Church, 18 May, 1965.

Editorial

PLEASE DEFINE!

(Continued from page 5)

sary and dangerous confusion is created which, understandably, is greeted by the ridicule and criticism of the world. We therefore, repeat our request to those persons and organizations which are using the word liberalism so liberally: "First agree amongst yourselves as to what, precisely, the word means — and then we can continue the discussion!"

Inleidingsartikel

DEFINISIE ASSEBLIEF!

(Vervolg van bladsy 5)

spot en kritiek van die wêreld op die hais kan haal. Daarom herhaal ons ons versoek aan die persone en liggame wat die woord liberalisme tans so liberaal gebruik: „Kom eers onder mekaar ooreen oor wat die woord presies behels — en dan kan ons verder gesels!"

Editorial:

Please Define!

The word **liberalism** has been used more liberally in the past few months than, perhaps, any other word; especially by quasi-specialists who, without first of all defining what they mean, have gone on to use it as a delightfully swear-word. Every careful observer quickly noticed that the different meanings the word has in a theological, moral, political or economic context were hardly ever distinguished, and the fact that the everyday use of liberalism has both favourable and unfavourable connotations was not pointed out. And meanwhile, to crown it all, a new word — neo-liberalism — has also been added! It does not require a prophet to predict that, because of the lack of explicit definition and understanding, the fight against liberalism as something dangerous and evil can easily become a farce — especially if ecclesiastical bodies organize congresses without first of all deciding exactly what they mean by liberalism.

We were particularly interested (or should we say amused) to notice that **Pro Veritate** was attacked because of its "liberalistic tendencies". Now we wish to remind our readers (and especially our critics) that **Pro Veritate** since its inception has been founded on the Word of God and that its only intention is to encourage a discussion, in dialogue form, of real problems on the basis and in the light of the Word of God. God's Word is and remains the supreme and final authority as far as we are concerned. Anyone, therefore, who wishes to exalt himself and his human freedom above the truth or the authority of God's Word is regarded by us as a liberal. Thus, the *theological* use of liberalism refers to that line of thought in which men are free to distort, dilute and disown the truth of God's Word.

We, therefore, heartily agree with the way in which Prof. F. J. M. Potgieter defined liberalism at a recent conference on the subject in Johannesburg. (A brief report was sent to us and appears in this issue.) But for the same reason we must strongly condemn the misuse of the word by persons such as Dr. A. P. Treurnicht. And when we listen to the incomplete, one-sided and sometimes completely archaic exposition of the Scriptures which someone such as Dr. Treurnicht uses in his series of S.A.B.C. broadcasts, then we can only exclaim: "Save us from such liberalism!"

Anyone who soberly and objectively evaluates the recent pronouncements on liberalism in our country will also notice that it is those persons and organizations whose convictions on the ecumenical movement and race relations are based on the Bible and differ from the traditional view of some Afrikaners, who are especially decried as liberals. It is precisely because our opponents are afraid to discuss these topics responsibly and on the basis of the Scriptures that it suits them not to define clearly what they mean by liberalism. In this way unneces-

(Continued in last column on previous page)

Inleidingsartikel:

Definisie Asseblief!

Daar is seker geen woord wat die afgelope maande meer kwistig gebruik is as die woord **liberalisme** nie, veral deur kwasi-deskundiges wat, sonder om vooraf 'n duidelike definisie te gee, voortgegaan het om dit as heerlike skelwoord te gebruik. Dit het elke noulettende waarnemer baie gou opgeval dat daar byna nooit onderskei is tussen die verskillende betekenisse van die woord soos gebruik in teologiese, sedelike, politieke of ekonomiese sin nie, en ook nie tussen die feit dat die begrip liberalisme in sy alledaagse gebruik 'n gunstige sowel as ongunstige betekenis het nie. En intussen is, om alles te kroon, 'n nuwe woord: neo-liberalisme ook nog bygevoeg! Dit neem geen profeet om te voorspel dat by gebrek aan 'n duidelike begrip en definisie die bekamping van liberalisme as 'n gevaar of 'n euwel baie maklik in 'n klug kan ontaard nie — veral as kerklike liggame kongresse gaan hou sonder om vooraf vas te stel wat presies by liberalisme bedoel word.

Veral was ons geïnteresseerd (of moet ons sê: geamuseerd) om te sien dat **Pro Veritate** aangeval word vanweë sy liberalistiese tendense. Nou wil ons ons lesers (en veral ons kritici) graag daaraan herinner dat **Pro Veritate** hom vanaf sy oprigting gestel het op grondslag van die Woord van God en dat sy hele opset is om 'n gesprek oor die bespreking van aktuele vraagstukke te stimuleer op die basis en in die lig van die Woord van God. Finale en hoogste gesag is en bly vir ons Gods Woord. Enigiemand dus wat homself as outonome mens wil verhef bo die waarheid of die gesag van Gods Woord, word deur ons gesien as 'n liberalis. Liberalisme, in *teologiese* sin, is dus dié denkrigting wat homself vry ag om die waarheid van Gods Woord te verwing, te verwater of te verwerp.

Daarom kan ons heelhartig saamstem met die definisie van liberalisme deur prof. F. J. M. Potgieter gegee op 'n konferensie oor liberalisme onlangs in Johannesburg gehou en soos weergegee in 'n kort ingestuurde verslag wat in hierdie uitgawe verskyn. Maar om dieselfde rede moet ons die misbruik van die woord by persone soos dr. A. P. Treurnicht ten sterkste veroordeel. En as ons luister na die onvolledige, eensydige en soms totaal verouderde Skrif-uitleg wat 'n persoon soos dr. Treurnicht in sy reeks radiopraatjies oor die S.A.U.K. gee dan kan ons alleen uitroep: "Bewaar ons van sulke liberalisme!"

Wie al die onlangse uitsprake oor liberalisme in ons land nugter en objektief beoordeel, sal opmerk dat ook en veral dié persone en instansies wat Bybelse oortuiginge oor ekumeniese en rasseverhoudinge huldig wat van die tradisionele sieninge van sommige Afrikaners verskil, as liberaliste uitgekryt word. Juis omdat ons teëstanders bevrees is om 'n verantwoorde gesprek oor hierdie sake rondom die Skrif aan te knoop, pas dit hulle om nie vooraf duidelik te omlin wat hulle onder die term liberalisme verstaan nie. Daardeur word 'n onnodige en gevaarlike verwarring geskep wat ons met reg die

(Vervolg in laaste kolom op vorige bladsy)

WHAT IS A HEBREW CHRISTIAN?

— JACOB BLUM

The people of Israel in our tender young State have been drawn from many and diverse backgrounds; and they are now in process of becoming a strong and unified nation, despite all their difficulties. One question frequently asked among them is: "What is a Hebrew Christian?" To the Jewish mind an anomalous situation is created when a Jew makes a claim to being a Christian. A clear answer to the question will provide a better understanding among all our people everywhere.

JEW AND GENTILE

As a prelude to that answer, let us first consider the terms **Jew** and **Gentile**. Briefly, a Jew is a person born into a Jewish family, a descendant of Abraham the Hebrew, through Isaac and Jacob and the twelve sons of Jacob, according to the **Tenach** (O.T.). He is a member of the Jewish race quite apart from choice or anything he is or does. Whatever land he may live in, he is nevertheless a Jew by race.

A Gentile is a person who is born into a non-Jewish family. He may be an American Gentile, or French or German or Russian or of any other nation, but he is ever and always a Gentile by birth.

CHRISTIAN

A Christian, on the contrary, is a term which denotes **choice**. It denotes one, whatever his race, who has **chosen** to be a follower of Christ. Contrary to popular thought, no one was ever **born a Christian**, although he may have been born into a Christian environment. People of any race may **choose** to become followers of the Lord Jesus Christ and thus become **Christians**. The first Christians were all Jews; and their Lord and Leader had a Jewish mother. In spite of persecution, even unto death, the early Christian Jews successfully propagated their faith in Jesus as Messiah and Redeemer. As a happy Gentile once said: "If we are wrong, it is the fault of you Jews, for you started us off in this way."

It is a sad fact that there are many counterfeit Christians among Gentiles who have never had a vital faith in the supernatural power of the Lord Jesus Messiah to transform the lives of believers, although they

may have been reared in or been touched by Christian families and thus have made profession. There are Jews also who are Christians only in name, and who bring reproach upon Christianity because of a hypocritical effort to conform to their environment or because of a lust for financial gain. Nevertheless, these counterfeits do not invalidate **genuine Christianity** which is set forth in **Brith Hachodesh** (New Testament) and exemplified in those possessing a living faith.

JEWS WHO ARE CHRISTIANS

What is the status of a Jewish Christian? Since the establishment of the State of Israel, this question has become of great importance. Does the fact that a Jew believes in Jesus Christ and has not been baptized, mean that he automatically has ceased to be a Jew? This view is contrary to the words of our rabbis of blessed memory who taught that every Jew has a part in the world to come which Rambam explains thus: "Although a Jew has sinned (that is, has become an apostate), he is still a Jew."

The Jewish Christian is a one hundred per cent Jew. From the religious viewpoint, he has not ceased to be a Jew (were such a thing possible), for he has not adopted a strange religion nor repudiated the Torah. On the contrary, he has embraced the completion of Israel's **religion**. For Judaism from the beginning was founded for the Messiah. Without Him Judaism is a frame without a picture, a body without a head, a society without significance. Notice how full of reference to Messiah are the Jewish prayers. With faith in the Messiah, the Christian Jew is indeed a complete Jew. The Christian Gentile by

contrast, has repudiated his heathen background, has believed the Jewish Scriptures and has embraced the Jewish Messiah, as foretold in the Old Testament and revealed in the New.

The Christian Jew or Jewess believes wholeheartedly that Jesus, blessed be His Name, is indeed the Messiah whom the prophets foretold, and for whose coming our fathers watched, hoping that God would raise up One from the seed of David to deliver His People. He believes that Jesus of Nazareth is indeed the Shiloh of whom our father Jacob prophesied when he said, "The scepter shall not depart from Judah, nor a lawgiver from between his feet, until Shiloh come; and unto him shall the gathering of the peoples be" (Genesis 49:10). At the time when Jesus came, the scepter **did** depart from Judah and people from all nations did gather themselves unto Him!

A Christian Jew believes that Messiah has suffered and died for the sins of the world as said the prophet Isaiah: "Surely he hath borne our griefs and carried our sorrows: yet we did esteem him stricken, smitten of God and afflicted. But he was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities, the chastisement of our peace was upon him and with his stripes we are healed. All we like sheep have gone astray, we have turned every one to his own way, and the Lord hath laid on him the iniquity of us all" (Isaiah 53:4, 5).

The Jewish Christian believes that Messiah has risen from the dead on the third day as it was prophesied in the **Tenach**: "For thou wilt not leave my soul in hell (Sheol, the netherworld), neither wilt thou suffer thy holy one to see corruption." (Psalm 16:10) He further believes that Messiah has ascended to heaven, from whence He will return to us in the last day to rule in righteousness and peace over a world set free. "The Lord said unto my Lord," said David, "Sit thou at my right hand, until I make thine enemies thy footstool" (Psalm 110:1).

What is a Hebrew Christian?

Moreover the Christian Jew believes that Jesus, the Messiah, has personally forgiven his sins, when he came seeking faith, and has imparted to him eternal life in the Holy Spirit; and he has experienced love, joy, peace, and hope which he has never before known. He has seen the prophecies of the Old Testament fulfilled in the New Testament and has experienced in his own life many of the promised blessings. The remainder he confidently believes will be experienced, as promised, when Messiah Jesus returns as King.

THE CHRISTIAN JEW AND HIS FELLOW JEWS

What effect do these beliefs have upon his relations with his fellow Jews? From a national standpoint, the Christian Jew is not a deserter, as some Jews say. He has not broken ties with his nation, nor with its past. He has not passed over into another camp. He has already attained to the position to which other Jews will yet come, as it is written: "And I will pour upon the house of David and upon the inhabitants of Jerusalem the Spirit of grace and supplication; and they shall look unto me whom they have pierced, and they shall mourn for him as one mourneth for his only son, and shall be in a bitterness for him as one that is in bitterness for his first-born." (Zechariah 12:10) Again: "And so all Israel shall be saved, as it is written: There shall come out of Zion the Deliverer and shall turn away ungodliness from Jacob". (Romans 11:26, Isaiah 59:20).

The Christian Jew enthuses over the State of Israel. Shall he not rejoice when he sees his people, who have been scattered and persecuted throughout the world, now returning to the land which the Lord caused their fathers to inherit according to His promise? His heart rejoiced as he sees his people, who were forced to be the peddlers among the nations, now becoming a normal people, sitting again "under their own vine and fig tree" turning the wilderness into a fruitful field, digging wells in the desert to water the

parched ground, speaking their own language, the language of the Torah, and singing their own songs.

Christian Jews want to be recognized as true Jews and as an inseparable part of their nation. They merit the confidence and love of their brothers, the children of Israel. Many of them participated in Israel's War for Liberation. Many even came from other lands to enlist in the army, and they were received with open arms. Many are taking part in all branches of the work of building up the Land. Even if their brethren treat them with enmity and seek to deprive them of their just rights and privileges in a democracy, Jewish Christians must refuse to relinquish these rights and must continue their efforts to be recognized as true Jews. If they should fail to persist in these efforts, then they would indeed be proving that they are apostates who have lost the spiritual roots of Judaism, as many of their people think.

How can a true Christian Jew forsake his brothers? Hear what the greatest of all Christian Jews, the Apostle Paul, wrote: "For I could wish that myself were accursed from Christ for my brethren, my kinsmen according to the flesh: who are Israelites; to whom pertaineth the adoption, and the glory, and the covenants, and the giving of the Law, and the service of God, and the promises; whose are the fathers, and of who, as concerning the flesh, Christ came, who is over all, God blessed forever, Amen." (New Testament, Romans 9:3.5). Jesus Himself said: "For salvation is of (i.e. from) the Jews." (John 4:21).

RELIGIOUS FREEDOM

This loyalty of Christian Jews to their own people does not hinder the wonderful fellowship of all true believers in Jesus Christ — God forbid! The Jewish Christian is thankful also for God's grace in permitting him to belong to this People, of whom all the prophets declared that they would return to their land and be a blessing to the whole world (Genesis 12:1.3) His heart burns within him at the first signs of the fulfillment of these ancient prophecies, knowing that a blessed future is assured to the people of Israel, and already with the eye of faith seeing that future realized.

Because he has come back to the

God of his fathers in a real way, the Christian Jew can effectively combat anti-Semitism, for he is both Christian and Jew; and he can show that Christianity and anti-Semitism are diametrically opposed to each other. His own faith in Jesus as Messiah can win him a hearing from the Gentiles; and he can work to give them a correct view of Israel. The importance of such a ministry on Israel's behalf is indeed great.

The religious freedom which the government of Israel as a democratic state has proclaimed must be demonstrated in the case of Christian Jews. Along with his contribution of enthusiasm and hard work, he should be free to proclaim the Good News of Jesus as Messiah-Redeemer and soon-returning King. Where should such a testimony be more acceptable than in their own land where there need be no fear that Jews believing in Jesus, blessed be His Name, will be assimilated among the Gentiles?

Furthermore, the Christian Jew understands the world-wide mission of Israel to be the spreading of the light of the Torah and the preaching of the Gospel of the Messiah in the last days to the ends of the earth (Genesis 12:1.3; Isaiah 27:6; Isaiah 43:21; Revelation 7). He knows that to fulfill this mission, the Jews must come back to a vital faith in the God of Israel and in the true Messiah.

Finally, the Christian Jew because of his faith can be an encouragement among his own people, many of whom do not carry in their hearts the comforting messages of the Holy Scriptures as he does. Because of his Messianic hope, he is sure that despite serious obstacles, Israel will succeed in building up the land and the State. The present regathering is what true Christians of all nations have been anticipating long before the days of Herzl. Christian Jews, nourished upon the promises of God, know that God is regathering the sons of Israel to their own land, to which Messiah Jesus will return to be their King and King of kings. The day of Messiah's glorious reign is drawing near. Hallelujah! Praise the name of the Lord!

(The Rev. Jacob Blum is a missionary of the American Messianic Fellowship in Israel, the country of his birth. He became a Christian during his internment as a P.O.W. during the First World War.)

GIVE A DOG A BAD NAME . . .

— G. M. MES

PRO VERITATE, one has been led to believe, seeks to provide a forum where contact can be established between the different denominations to foster and, in some ways, to represent the essential spiritual unity of the Christian Church.

This is a high ideal and one is sorry to see it fail so miserably.

In organising this forum it seems to have been overlooked that the role of mediator needs infinite care and tact, rather than single-minded devotion and a knowing that one is right.

The weak and the unsure characteristically build a wall around themselves and it is natural that anything that looks as if it could break it down, or even weaken it, will be considered to be dangerous and therefore inimical. Such things are fought with every means at the disposal of those who feel themselves beleaguered.

In this context one remembers a bit of homely wisdom that should have been considered here because it can become a dangerous weapon. "Give a dog a bad name and hang it", is, alas, true and it can hardly be denied that **Pro Veritate** has done little to avoid getting that bad name. One almost has the impression that it is trying to earn it because much of its contents actually reads like an overflow from the "Letters to the Editor" in the "counterslanted" newspapers of our land.

PROPAGANDA

The impression that the article "The Rule of God and White Supremacy" made on me was that this was no longer legitimate argument but blatant and even unbridled "propaganda" — however, honest the writer may have been in his intentions. It certainly was **not** a reasoned search for an acceptable solution or an exhortation to unity. If it had been published in any other guise than as a "religious discourse" it would have merited the banning of **Pro Veritate** itself.

Critical reading leaves little doubt that Myrick's emotions must have run away with both his pen and his good sense, but the editors should have seen to it that it went no further.

The article begins with a remark about the Prime Minister congratulating the Rotary Club for their "magnificent gesture of true South Africanism."

In a total **non-sequitur** this official accolade for "patriotism" is linked with what "one hears" about our way of life being a Christian one (where the main grudge of the Church is that Rotary is not primarily Christian!) and that South Africa is supposed to be a "bulwark of Christian Civilisation on a pagan continent". (The author is steering towards something else but the Prime Minister had to be included so that he could also, by implication, be a recipient of the invective at the end of the article.)

Then another **non-sequitur** follows. The writer asks if our way of life is **so** Christian and if we can defend it. Neither of the two previous statements say **how** Christian we are supposed to be (for instance, in relation to any of the European countries to which the writer gives the moral right to criticise us). The vaunted "bulwark" could also just as well be maintained by a merely nominally Christian State.

Nothing cogent about the subject of the article has as yet been said at this stage. What has been done is to create an atmosphere of slightly sneering ill will.

Anyone who has read this, not only with his eyes but also with his mind, knows what is coming but even then the author exceeds all one's fearful expectations.

AN UNFORTUNATE CHOICE

For a reasoned attack on "Apartheid" and "White Supremacy" there could, however, hardly have been a more unfortunate choice than Hosea, whom Myrick now drags into the argument.

The introduction is an (what one hopes to be) unconscious playing around with the meaning of "a way of life" — first that of the Canaanites and then that of the Hebrews

who adopted it.

This adoption is interestingly explained and made understandable with quotations so that one gets the idea that the writer knows what he is talking about. As a result, the reader forgets to use his critical faculties.

Lulled into a lack of vigilance one hardly notices (as one is not supposed to do) that, at the end of page 13 the word "traditional" has been added in the sentence: "The people has substituted Baal for Yahweh; a pleasant, **traditional** way of life, for the stern righteousness of God." Without the word "traditional" this sentence is entirely correct and it is against **this** that Hosea did lift his voice in protest. What the prophet said, however, was that the way of life the Israelites had adopted was **not** their traditional way of life and that they should immediately return to the way of life of their forefathers!

By putting it as he does, the writer inverts all the meanings; but he has to do this because, consciously or unconsciously, he is aiming at the, to him hateful, Afrikaner's "traditional way of life", which he intends to equate with that of the unfaithful Israelites and, especially, the excesses of Baalism.

Thereafter, to make confusion worse confounded, the South African "way of life" concept is itself distorted and twisted out of context and perspective. "The distinctive element in this way of life, which sets it apart from other 'European' cultures, is the belief in and the practice of white supremacy and segregation," he says.

This is a popular, but nevertheless fallacious, distortion of facts for "White Supremacy and Segregation" has been the "traditional way of life" of **all** European nations for the last few hundred years — and, deep down, still is.

How else did we acquire our Empire? How else did the Americans take America and considered themselves justified in exterminating the Red Indians like vermin, paying a bonus for scalps (even of women and children) like we pay it for jackal tails? How else did the

Give a dog a bad name . . .

Dutch take the East Indies, the English their world-encircling pink spots on the maps of fifty years ago — and we ourselves South Africa?

The Supremacy was there, but what about the Segregation?

It is true that there were few, if any, segregation laws but that was because we were so sure of our supremacy that laws were not necessary to underline it.

The "natives" were automatically segregated.

How many "native" members were there in the English "Clubs" of the Empire up to, say, ten years ago? And has Myrick never sensed the final degradation implied in the term of "going native", however intelligent and worthwhile such a person might have been?

It is our South Africa that, for good or for evil, has stuck to the "traditional way of life" and even enshrined it, to some extent, in its laws.

The "other European cultures" have forsaken the traditional way of life of their forefathers and are now demanding that we must follow suit, even if it happens to kill us.

Admittedly they have done so for the highest of high ethical motives; but also because they could no longer produce the fighting men that could make supremacy stick, and because they themselves ran no personal and immediate risk of having the rest of **their** traditional way of life destroyed by it. (When it turns out that that risk is still there, even in relatively minor details, we see what happens in Smithwick, Little Rock and other places too numerous to mention.)

These are unpleasant truths but one does not banish them by twisting the meanings and implications of words like "traditional way of life". If a reasoned and peaceful solution is possible (and the chance for that seems very remote) then it can only come from facing the truth with open eyes as Hosea did when he exhorted the Israelites to return to their traditional way of life, to resume their Hebrew Supremacy (as the only children of Yahweh) and their Segregation.

Finally, to underline the unfortunate choice made by taking Hosea

as an example in this case, it is a chastening thought for those who hate "supremacy" and "segregation" that, if the Israelites had not listened to Hosea and if they had **not** closed their ranks against the Gentiles, if they had not practised almost total segregation and clung to their traditional "beleaguered" way of life, they would, like all the other tribes in the area have been swamped out of existence in the restless boiling pot of the Middle East. And then there could have been no Christ and no Christian religion — at least not as we know it today!

After having in this strange way established his launching pad and equated us with the traitorous Baal worshippers, Myrick gives his tongue free rein and bursts forth in a diatribe that reminds one of Savonarola. It is so exaggerated and hate-ridden that he sometimes almost becomes incoherent (e.g. "As the worshippers of Baal enjoyed the physical pleasure of sexual licence at the high places and thus guaranteed for themselves a high standard of living, so those who practise white supremacy also are physically rewarded for their devotion to this way of life.")

Everything about us is "evil" and "unjust" — things are "spawned" amongst us, we "indulge" in sports (as if even that is evil!) — and finally one cannot help but end by wondering at this tirade of Old Testamentary invective in a professed Christian whom his gentle Master must have at least tried to teach to love all men, even "degenerate" White Supremacists! Or is it only the word "Raka" that one may not say to one's brother?

All this is very understandable and human — all too human in fact — **but it does not belong in a Christian Magazine that is officially dedicated to the spiritual unification of the Church.**

It proves nothing, it solves nothing and it serves no other purpose than to give the dog a bad name, which, one presumes, is the last thing that the editorial board of **Pro Veritate** had in mind when it decided to publish this deplorable effort at "provoking" Christian Unity.

Even if it had all been true (which, thank God, it isn't) it could only do more harm than good **in this place**. The harm has obviously been done for no self respecting government, representing its people, could let

such an outburst pass unnoticed. As it is, the reaction has been surprisingly mild because, one imagines, those in authority must have realised that this was a case of "they know not what they do". One can accept that this one "mistake" could possibly have been an oversight, but in the next number we find an echo that threatens to make a mockery out of **Pro Veritate** and to change it into "**Veritas Nostra**" — a magazine with an overt anti-apartheid and anti-government message. Such a magazine might have a place in our community, it might even be desirable — but that is not the intention of **Pro Veritate** — or is it? A magazine with a message does not seek to find the truth. It tries to establish its own.

CONFUSED

Let us take a quick look at "The land is God's" which, although more controlled in its wording, has the same message and the same totally confused quality of thinking.

The sentence: "The White man has had an almost insatiable hunger for land in South Africa", already expresses both.

Land-hunger has been a characteristic of all European races. It made the Spaniards carve out their great Haciendas in Middle America when the gold fever had abated. It made the Americans gobble up a continent. It also made the Israelites exterminate the Canaanites. So why specially mention our South African land-hunger as if it was a particularly vile disease, peculiar only to us?

A little further on the sentence "A similar passion for land exists in the African community" carries no "diseased" overtones for, **to the African**, it is apparently quite normal and healthy to harbour such a "passion".

But even then, this statement is basically false, for **ownership** of land was never a part of the African "traditional way of life". The African has never in his history "owned" a "farm" and it is for that reason that he does not know either the possibility of irrigation or the duty of the "farmer" to take care of the soil.

The African has never been a farmer. His wife has been a mealie- or a millet-planter. **His** way of life has always centred around his cattle.

(Please turn over)

Give a dog a bad name . . .

(Continued from page 9)

The "occasionally expressed wish" of some individuals for land were motivated by it having become a status symbol in imitation of the white man's values. That this is so is only too clearly shown by the latest reports about the reasons for the low productivity of the African owned farms into which the Kenya Highlands have been carved up.

The overall tenor of Myrick's article is, however, that the land is not ours but that it belongs to God because that is the only way in which it could be possible for him to question the moral right of the White man to his present possession of the land. (Yet Myrick makes the mistake of expressing sympathy with the African who says "The land was **ours!**")

A DIFFICULT QUESTION

Again the Israelites are now drawn into the picture to give a religious and Biblical justification to the argument. To avoid a rather obvious but difficult question the writer starts with God already in firm and practical possession of Palestine, the ownership of which He has delegated to his Chosen Race. *He sees to it that, if they abuse their delegated rights to it, they are "thrown off the land", etc.*

Instead of asking himself who more "abuses" the land, the White man with his modern farming methods or the African with his predatory agriculture, we find a thesis on the **practical** application of the will of God (through men) to the problems of Naboth's Vineyard which is as dangerous an example as was Hosea's exhortation about maintaining the traditional way of life.

We read: "And no one can break these traditions by expropriating land without the family's approval. (See 1 Kings 21:3). For God himself has given this land into the keeping of this family. This belief stands in stark contrast to the way in which many whites wrested South African soil from Africans without regard for tribal and family traditions." Without stressing too much that now, all at once, it seems that there is after all some validity in "tradi-

tional ways of life", one cannot help but wonder if the Israelites took the necessary notice of the tribal and family traditions of the Canaanites when they "wrested" the land away from them.

Furthermore, if God "gave" the land to the Israelites what is wrong with the idea that God "gave" South Africa to the Whites so that they should make proper use of it? What otherwise than that it must seem almost a blasphemy to Myrick that God should have any love for the White men of this sinful world? If God gave us the land, the rest of the parallel holds true for, like the Israelites, our Government also will not permit the land to be wrested by whites from other whites. It also "respects the tradition whereby God has entrusted this field to the family of Naboth" — or to that of van der Merwe.

The overall argument is, however, fallacious and tendentious. It is true that God owns the land; but He also owns everything else, our mines and our motor cars, the money in our banks and the houses in which we live, our very bodies and our souls; or has Myrick overlooked these little details? With that the whole argument falls to pieces and resolves itself into the statement that, if we do not live according to God's will, we ask for His wrath to come down and destroy us. Only His pity and the salvation which Jesus offers to Sinners can save us from a well-deserved doom.

That, however, is the burden of **all** Christian teaching. Against this background the presented argument serves merely as an artificial and essentially contrived framework designed as a basis from which to castigate the White man for his alleged mistreatment of the Black. No actual evidence for this mistreatment is brought forward; it is simply taken for granted and we are once again warned of hell-fire under the transparent guise of talking about something quite different.

And this the editors of **Pro Veritate** should have noticed!

They should have noticed that the real subject of this article has nothing to do with the Unity of the Church and that, by publishing it they, in effect, helped to destroy the Christian Institute of which **Pro Veritate** is, rightly or wrongly, considered to be the mouthpiece. One

is afraid that there is little doubt that, in this way, the Christian Institute has established itself in the minds of people as an anti-apartheid "party" in the Church and, as such, it has as little chance of success as the Liberal Party in politics. It has, however, also killed its chances of doing any genuine good work.

By publishing articles that are of no higher intellectual or moral standard than purely political diatribes, it has dragged religion **down** into politics instead of teaching us, as it should have done, that we must not forget our religious values in the game of politics where winning (and not truth) is the final yardstick by which all things are measured.

Dr. G. M. Mes is a surgeon and author of "Now-men and Tomorrow-men" and "Mr. White Man, What Now?" (P. Allen Myrick has indicated that he will reply to this article in the October issue.—Ed.)

Readers' Views

THE LAND QUESTION

Dear Sir,

On Tuesday morning, the 17th August, I heard your paper and, in particular, an article by Rev. P. A. Myrick attacked by the S.A.B.C.

Particular exception was taken to Mr. Myrick's statement: "This means that white South Africa has a terrible guilt, for which it must atone. Because of the white man's ruthless plunder of millions of acres of land from the Africans who owned it, he stands condemned before God."

Yet the previous night the Prime Minister stated: "There is no question of the Government allowing land ownership to Bantu in our Bantu residential areas."

In Lady Selborne, Pretoria, freehold rights will be taken away from the Africans as they were taken away in Sophiatown and in many other places.

The present policy is that the bulk of the population will not be able to own land in 87% of the country.

Mr. Myrick is right and your paper is to be congratulated for publishing articles like his.

Keep up the good work.

Yours sincerely,

(Rev.) F. D. Phillips,
91, 7th Street,
New Township,
SPRINGS.

DIE KERK BUITE SUID-AFRIKA

— PROF. B. B. KEET

SPANJE

Van 4 - 7 Mei is in die kerk Nonciado in Madrid 'n reeks byeenkomste gehou wat vir die toekomstige ontwikkeling van die protestantisme in Spanje van belang is. Die Evangeliese Raad vir Spanje is tot stand gebring waarin onder voorsitterskap van Sir Kenneth Grubb uit Londen, verteenwoordigers van die Wêreldraad van Kerke en van verskillende buitelandse kerklike hulpverleningsrade sitting gehad het.

Hierdie raad is toe ontbind en 'n nuwe Spaanse Evangeliese Raad gevorm waarin verteenwoordigers van die Iglesia Episcopal Reformada, die Iglesia Evangelica Española en die Baptiste kerke in Spanje sitting het, terwyl verteenwoordigers van die buitelandse hulporganisasies as adviseurs na die jaarvergadering uitgenooi is. 'n Tweede liggaam wat homself opgehef het, was die kommissie van toesig op die „Centro de formasion teologica” in Barcelona. Die Protestantse kerke het hulle bereid verkaar om self die verantwoordelikheid te dra vir die teologiese vorming van predikante en leke.

In die jaarvergadering van die Spaanse Evangeliese Raad is 'n oorsig gegee van die ontwikkeling van verhoudinge tussen die Rooms-katolieke Kerk en die regering enersyds en die Protestante andersyds. Ten behoeve van die 30,000 Protestante, die 12,000 nie-kerklike vreemdelinge en die 10,000 Jode en Moslems in Spanje is in 1964 in die Spaanse ministerraad 'n wetsontwerp eenstemmig aanvaar om die juridiese erkenning van eiendom op onroerende goed, erkenning van opleidingsinstelling, uitgewerye en boekhandels, verteenwoordiging van die formaliteite by burgerlike huweliksluiting, erkenning van ampsdraers, verbod op alle diskriminasie en op proselietisme vas te stel — 'n belangrike stap voorwaarts op die weg na gelyke regte vir die nie-Roomse bevolkingsgroepe. Op 30 November is egter besluit om met die uitvaardiging van die statuut te wag totdat die Vatikaanse konsilie hom oor die gewetensvryheid uitgespreek het. Intussen het Gen. Franco in sy oujaarsrede hom uitgespreek — „vir 'n regverdige en goed begrepe godsdiensvryheid.” Daarteenoor is die invoerregte op Bybels uitermate hoog.

VIETNAM

Bekend is die feit dat nie alle Amerikaners die optrede van Amerika in Vietnam goedkeur nie. So

het vooraanstaande onderwysmanne uit alle dele van die volk in Mei-maand 'n verklaring in die *New York Times* gepubliseer, waarin die Amerikaanse politiek in Vietnam veroordeel en op onmiddellike staking van bombardemente op Noord-Vietnam aangedring word, om die poginge tot vredesonderhandelinge te bevorder. Daar word sterk beswaar gemaak teen 'n aantyging van Minister Rusk wat sou gesê het dat hy hom verbaas oor die onnoselheid van opgevoede mense en die hardkoppige veronagsaming van duidelike feite deur mense wat veronderstel word om ons jongmense te leer dink. Hierdie beledigende taal, verklaar die opvoedkundiges laat 'n mens dink dat die administrasie alle kritiek wil stilmaak. Dit is maklik verstaanbaar waarom die Staatssekretaris boos is (so word voortgegaan). Die redes wat hy noem, het niks te doen met die onnoselheid van die akademiese gemeenskap nie. Hy is boos omdat die feite en wyer implikasies wat deur hierdie kritici aangevoer is, so baie offisiële verklaringe weerspreek. Dit is nie die geleerdes nie, maar die leiers van die administrasie wat 'n hardkoppige veronagsaming van die duidelike feite openbaar het.

Die duidelike feite van die situasie is —

- (1) dat die 1954 ooreenkoms te Genève oor Vietnam geen voorsiening maak vir 'n verdeelde Vietnam in twee volksgroepe nie — en
- (2) dat ten spyte van Amerikaanse offisiële verklaringe dat hy vryheid vir Vietnam soek, die skaal van Amerikaanse intervensie nie strook met die doelstelling van selfbeskikking nie.

Die situasie in Vietnam sluit ernstige morele vraagstukke in, nie slegs diplomatieuse of taktiese nie. „Ons besit as volk ontsaglike groot mag. Om dit te gebruik op onverskillige en barbaarse manier sou die hele grondslag van Amerikaanse

leierskap in gevaar stel.” Meer as 800 persone het die dokument onderteken, onder hulle hoogleraars van bekende universiteite soos Harvard en Yale.

M. BUBER †

Martin Buber, die Israelitiese filosoof en teoloog, is op 87-jarige leeftyd onlangs in Jerusalem oorlede. Van alle Joodse denkers het hy miskien die grootste invloed gehad op sy tydgenote, Christene sowel as eie volksgenote, deur die ontwikkeling van 'n lewensbeskouing wat deur verskillende rigtinge as uiters waardevol beskou is.

Vir 'n rubriek soos hierdie is dit nie moontlik om op al sy gedagtes in te gaan nie. Genoeg as ons attent maak op hoofgedagte, nl. dat die mens nie moet vra na sy verhouding teenoor dinge nie, maar teenoor persone, nie **ek** en **dit** nie, maar **ek** en **jy**. Sy hoofwerk heet dan ook **Ich und Du**: ek en u, die mens in sy ontmoeting met die medemens en met God. In die volgende uittreksels uit waarderings vir sy lewe en werk sal een en ander meer duidelikheid verkry.

Gebore in Wenen is hy, na die skeiding van sy ouers, deur sy grootvader opgevoed, 'n man wat 'n groot kenner van die Talmoed en van die Joodse tradisie was. In Wenen het hy filosofie studeer en het veral die invloed van Nietzsche ondergaan. Daar het hy ook met Theodor Herzl in aanraking gekom, wat sy belangstelling vir die Sionisme gaande gemaak het. Maar omdat hy die Sionisme meer as sosiaal-kulturele verskynsel gesien het, het hy hom losgemaak van die politieke Sionisme en was tot sy dood toe gekant teen die stigting van 'n Israelitiese Staat in Palestina. Hy het gestrewe na 'n Joodse nedersetting in Palestina waar Jode en Arabiere vreedsaam naas mekaar kon lewe. In sy studies oor die ou Joodse vroomheid en van die Ou Testament, het hy deur sy geskryfte die Europese kultuurgeskiedenis aansienlik verryk. Hierdie studies het hom ook gelei tot 'n nuwe vertaling van die Ou Testament in Duits, saam met enige medewerkers.

Volgens die **Nieuw Israelitisch Weekblad** het Buber se invloed in Israel spoedig verswak. Die eerbied (*Blaai om asb.*)

Die Kerk buite S.A.

(Vervolg van bladsy 11)

wat aan hom bewys is, het wel konstant gebly, het miskien nog gegroei, maar die gesag het verdwyn. Dan gaan die artikel uit die pen van Meester A. J. Hertzberg voort:—

Dit is nie so vreemd as menigeen sou dink nie, as hy hom afvra hoe dit kom dat Buber, wat steeds groter waardering in nie-Joodse kringe ingeoes het, juis onder die Jode, wie se geestelike erfdeel hy as persoonlike besit wou verwerf, en wie se ontwikkeling hom soseer ter harte gegaan het, soveel minder weerklank gevind het. Dit kom vandaar dat sy denke nie beperk gebly het by die formulering van 'n idee nie, maar pragmatiese toepassing daarvan in die werklikheid gevra het. **God is naby almal wat Hom soek met die waarheid wat hulle doen**, roep hy aanhoudend almal toe, en dit beteken dat dit op die daad, op die verwesenliking van die gedagte in die stoffelike realiteit aankom. Hy het nie net gedink nie; sy gedagtes hou 'n opdrag in. En dit is duidelik dat die vervulling van dié opdrag heeltemal iets ander is vir hom wat in werklikheid daarmee belas word, as vir hom vir wie hierdie opdrag — by alle bewondering wat hy daarvoor koester — net 'n platoniese strekking het. Met ander woorde, en baie eenvoudig uitgedruk: Jy moet dit maar doen as jy werklik daarvoor staan. En of jy kan, hang daarvan af, waar jy voor staan. Hulle kon nie, en Buber sê: hulle skiet te kort. Hulle antwoord: jy skiet te ver.

Die probleem wat Buber aan die orde gestel het, en dit nie in die skool van wysgere of in die kollegesaal nie, maar in die lewe self, soos dit hom elke dag aan ons voordoet, is die vraag van die verwesenliking van die mens as goddelike skepsel in sy samelewing met ander, in sy sosiale en politieke verhouding. Dit is die doelstelling, en meer as dit, 'n roeping van die allerhoogste gehalte, en niemand, of hy daaraan kan voldoen of nie, sal dit ontken nie.

Daar is dus niemand wat sal weier om aan Martin Buber 'n blywende plek in te ruim onder die grotes van gees of onder die groot sedelike leermeesters wat die Joodse volk voortgebring het nie. 'n Hele wêreld treur by sy dood om die verlies van 'n groot denker, 'n groot religieus-humanis, 'n man wie se lewe vervul

was van 'n ewige aan die mensheid gestelde sedelike eis.

GETUIENIS UIT MOSKOU

Die Bond van Protestantse Christene (Baptis) in Moskou het sy deelname aan die ekumeniese werk van die Wêreldraad van Kerke in sy blad „Bratsky Vestnik” (Broederlike BoodsAPPER) soos volg beskrywe: Christene wat God lief het met hulle hele hart, ken mekaar. Al het hulle ook verskillende opvattinge oor sake van minder belang, is hulle bewus van dieselfde vlam wat brand in hul harte — die liefde van Christus. Vandag bestaan daar die Wêreldraad van Kerke waaraan baie Christelike kerke behoort. Ons Protestantse Broederskap is ook lid daarvan.

Daar is diegene wat 'n groot verwagting van die Wêreldraad koester omdat hulle dink dat dit uiteindelik alle Christene in één Christelike kerk sal saambring. Na ons beskouing sal hierdie verwagting nooit vervul word nie. Ons sien die Wêreldraad van Kerke nie as die uitdrukking van die algemene kerk van Christus nie, omdat die wêreldkerk geen aardse Christelike gesag is of 'n aardse gemeenskap van Christelike organisasie nie. Eerder sluit dit almal in wat met die liefde van Christus vervul is.

Die Wêreldraad van Kerke is 'n suiwer aardse bond wat baie Christelike organisasies verteenwoordig, met insluiting van sommige wat nog nie ondervind het wat dit beteken om uit die Gees gebore te wees nie.

Waarom het die verskillende kerke dan aangesluit by die Wêreldraad? Hulle het dit gedoen ten einde mense van verskillende rigting vir gesamentlike bespreking van teologiese vraagstukke en ander probleme van ons tyd saam te bring; ook die probleem van internasionale vrede in ooreenstemming met die Woord van Christus: „Salig is die vredemakers want hulle sal kinders van God genoem word.”

Ons, so gaan die verklaring voort, het by die Wêreldraad van Kerke aangesluit om deur sy bemiddeling lig te werp op baie vraagstukke vanuit ons evangeliese standpunt. In die vergadering van die Wêreldraad en in persoonlike gesprekke kan hulle wat in die diens van die kerk staan en vervul is met die liefde van Christus, ander in wie se hart weinig of niks van dié liefde gevind word nie, aan die brand steek. In alle geval is persoonlike kontakte tussen

Christene van verskillende rigting binne die Wêreldraad baie nuttig. Dit is bekend dat persoonlike kontakte met persone uit ander kerke die oë van baie geestelike leiers geopen het om te beseef dat daar talle in ander kerke is wat ook eerlik in Christus glo en Hom met hul hele hart lief het. Dit is 'n onbetwisbare voordeel wat deur die Wêreldraad bewerkstellig is. Maar ons het geen illusies dat die Wêreldraad die belofte van Christus, dat dit een Herder en een kudde sal wees, in vervulling bring nie. Hierdie belofte sal deur Christus self vervul word wanneer Hy in sy heerlijkheid sal terugkom, en wanneer in Sy lig alles verstaan sal word wat ons nou nog nie kan verstaan nie. Net soos alle kunslike dof en betekenisloos word wanneer die son sy strale uitstoot, so sal die verbygaande godsdienstige gedagtes waaraan baie Christene hulle vasgeklem het, hulle belangrikheid in die skitterende lig van Christus verloor.

By bostaande, wat aan 'n verslag van die ontwikkeling in die Oosterse Europese Kerke deur die Wêreldraad ingestel, ontleen is, word aangegeven: Die Bond se opvatting van die taak van die Wêreldraad van Kerke, is dieselfde as die Wêreldraad se eie opvatting van sy taak, nl. nie as 'n super-kerk nie, maar slegs as orgaan om toenadering tussen die geskeide Christelike kerke te bevorder.

DIE EVANGELIE EN RASSEKONFLIKTE

Daar word teenswoordig soveel publisiteit aan die rassekonflikte, veral in Amerika, gegee dat die poging wat aangewend word om 'n beter verhouding tussen die rasse daar te stel, ook ons aandag verdien. Ons kom noemenswaardig terug op die veldtog wat deur Billy Graham in Alabama aan die gang gesit en voortgesit is in 'n tweede aksie, wat afgesluit is met 'n gemengde byeenkoms van 18.000 persone in Montgomery, hoofstad van Alabama.

Die vorige jaar was daar 'n rekord-opkoms van 35.000 in Birmingham, die grootste stad van Alabama. Hierdie keer het hy Montgomery gekies omdat dit as die moeilikste sentrum beskou is. Dit is die stad wat honderd jaar gelede gedien het as sentrum vir die Konfederasie van Suidelike State, en die vlag van die Konfederasie wapper nog steeds op die regeringsgebou. Dit is ook die stad van Martin Luther King, wat die boycott teen die

Die Kerk buite S.A.

busmaatskappy geleë het, en dit is die stad van goewerneur Wallace, verbete vyand van integrasie.

Die uitnodiging aan Billy Graham om juis hier 'n veldtog te begin, het gekom kort na die opmars van Selma na Montgomery in Maart l.l. en die versoek is ondersteun deur die grootste gedeelte van swart en blank predikante in die stad.

'n Uitvoerende Komitee, bestaande uit blankes en swartes het die voorbereidings getref en in die loop van die week is die byeenkomste deur 100,000 mense bygewoon. Verder is talle van kleiner byeenkomste en gesprekke gehou, o.a. met goewerneur Wallace wat egter geen gehoor gegee het aan 'n uitnodiging om 'n samekoms te besoek nie. Aan 'n uitnodiging aan Graham om die staatsparlement toe te spreek, kon geen gevolg gegee word nie omdat sy program oorbeset was.

By sy vertrek uit Alabama het hy gesê: „Ek is daarvan oortuig dat die sedelike en geestelike kragte in Alabama aanwesig is om 'n snelle ontwikkeling in die onderlinge begrip tussen die rasse te bewerkstellig. As die Ku Klux Klan rustig bly, as die ekstremiste van die organisasies vir gelyke burgerregte aan die staat die tyd gun om gewoon te raak aan die reeds aangenome wette, as die politici nie probeer om van die situasie misbruik te maak nie, as veral die Christelike liefde die oorhand kry, dan voorsien ek die dag dat die hele Amerika trots op Alabama sal wys weens die verhouding van rasse daar.”

As kanttekening by bostaande kan 'n uitspraak van Visser 't Hooft, algemene sekretaris van die Wêreldraad van Kerke, dien toe hy 'n gehoor van predikante, intellekteuele en besigheidsmanne te Ogemont naby Parys, toegesprek het. „Passiewe ko-eksistensie”, so het hy gesê. „is een van die maniere om 'n oplossing vir die ideologiese, ekonomiese en rassekonflikte van die wêreld te soek. Maar passiewe ko-eksistensie raak nie die oorsake van die konflikte aan nie, dit laat hulle slegs onder die oppervlakte gis totdat op 'n dag die uitbarsting geweldig as ooit plaasvind.” Hy verkies 'n aktiewe „pro-eksistensie” waar elkeen sy verantwoordelikheid aanvaar en almal saam na die oplossing soek. Vir rassekonflikte insonderheid, het hy die hoop uitgesprek dat 'n meer intensiewe samespreking oral onder-

neem sal word. Die belangrike rol wat die ekumeniese beweging hier kan speel, lê voor die hand.

FORMOSA, die eiland wat die hoofkwartiere vorm van Nasionalistiese Sjina, het in Junie die Eeufees van die Protestantisme op dié eiland gevier. Honderd jaar gelede het die eerste sendeling, Dr. James Maxwell, uit die Engelse Presbiteriaanse kerk sy arbeid daar as evangeliedienaar begin. Die herdenkingsfees was dus in eerste instansie dié van die Presbiteriaanse kerk, maar die ander protestantse kerke en sendinggenootskappe het daarby aangesluit, o.a. die Episkopaalse, Metodistiese, Lutherse en Baptiste kerke, en die Sjinese Sondagskool-konferensie, die

Sjinese Sendingbond en die Bybelgenootskap. Sedert 1954 het die kerk 'n beweging begin om die aantal lede te verdubbel en daarmee gepaard die aantal kerkgeboue te vermeerder. Die syfers toon aan dat daar in 1954, 410 kerkgeboue vir 86,000 lede beskikbaar was; nou na tien jaar is daar reeds 865 kerkgeboue vir nagenoeg 200,000 lede. Dr. E. Emmen, sekretaris-generaal van die Nederlandse Hervormde Kerk, wat 'n reis na Indonesië, die Filippyne, Formosa en Japan onderneem het, spreek van die ekumeniese opset van hierdie feesviering waar die aksent op die getuienis van die Evangelie saam met die ander kerke gelê is.

Readers' Views

A DARK SAYING

Dear Sir,

Dr. Cook's chairman's report to the S.C.A. was not in the first place addressed to us, readers of **Pro Veritate**, and I am very grateful to him for letting us sit in on a family meeting in such a friendly way. The point I wish to raise may seem at first sight one peripheral to the purpose of the Report, but it can never be other than central in any dialogue between Christians.

“Traditionally, those in the reformed tradition have tended to regard the Roman Catholics as the early Christians seem to have regarded the Jews, and for the same reason of a defective Christology” reports Dr. Cook; and it seems that he is in agreement with this tendency. I do not, as a Catholic, wish to object to being placed alongside the Jewish people. In this century the role of the Suffering Servant of God has been borne, in the extermination camps of Nazi Germany, by Jews rather than by Christians. I only hope the Jewish people will be willing, in their generosity, to receive us at their side as brothers under God.

But the Jews do not, after all, wish for the name of Christian. Catholics do; and it is hard to be told that we are as far from Christ Jesus in our theology as the Jews — though perhaps I have not grasped the point of Dr. Cook's analogy.

Working in the field of ecumenical theology today is like walking over an ice-field in a high wind. The whole landscape is in movement, and with some grinding and crashing old crevasses are bridged, others

slam shut and disappear altogether, yet others open up quite unexpectedly before our anguished gaze. Since only in Christ is our hope of unity, the christological crevasse is the most disheartening of all.

May I assure you and your readers that neither the Council of Trent nor the two Vatican Councils have repudiated the Gospel or the confessions of faith of Nicaea, Ephesus and Chalcedon. These are still for us the central source for our christology. Gustaf Aulen has a chapter in his **Reformation and Catholicity** entitled “Three confessions of Christ: Those of the Bible, the ancient Church, and the Reformation” in which he speaks of Chalcedon's great influence within modern Roman theology and acknowledges the Chalcedonian orthodoxy of the representative Catholic theologian Yves Congar. He ends his chapter: “In reality it is not a question of three different confessions, but of one and the same fundamental Christian confession. The three are one.”

In the light of this I wonder if there is not some misunderstanding about a mirage rather than a genuine crevasse? I should be most grateful to Dr. Cook if he would cast some light on what is for me a dark saying.

Yours sincerely,

(Fr.) Jerome Smith,
St. Peter's Seminary,
P.O. Box 10,
Hammanskraal.

(This letter has been referred to Dr. Cook. His reply will be published in October. — Editor.)

BOOK REVIEW

KERYGMA IN TECNOPOLIS

Harvey E. Cox — "THE SECULAR CITY — *Secularization and Urbanization in Theological Perspective*" (London, SCM, 1965) 276pp with Bibliography. R2.10.

Tecnopolis is Harvey Cox's word for representing "a new species of human community" which must be distinguished from both the species which preceded it; namely, tribal life and town life. The distinguishing marks of *tecnopolis* are the twin processes of secularization and urbanization.

SECULARIZATION

Here Cox relies on the work of Bonhoeffer and Van Peursen. The age of the secular city is an age in which man has delivered himself "first from religious and then from metaphysical control over his reason and his language". Nature and history are "defatalized" and man has to carry the can. The secular city

"no longer looks to religious rules and rituals for its morality or its meanings. For some religion provides a hobby, for others a mark of national or ethnic identification, for still others an esthetic delight. For fewer and fewer does it provide an inclusive and commanding system of personal and cosmic values and explanations"

URBANIZATION

Urbanization is the context in which secularization is emerging. "Urbanization" is not merely a quantitative term referring to population size or density. Urbanization

"means a structure of common life in which diversity and the disintegration of tradition are paramount. It means a type of impersonality in which functional relationships multiply. It means that a degree of tolerance and anonymity replace traditional moral sanctions and long-term acquaintanceships".

This (briefly) is the background to the central question with which Cox wrestles throughout the book — "are the twin processes of secularization and urbanization the *enemies* or the *fruits* of the Gospel?"

A BIRD'S EYE VIEW

Cox's attempt to answer that question is divided into four parts:

The Coming of the Secular City unearths the Biblical sources of secularization by means of an examination of the Creation, Exodus and Sinai Covenant from which, according to Cox, *tecnopolis* draws "the legitimate consequence of the impact of biblical faith on history"—namely, the disenchantment of nature (beginning with the Creation); the de-centralization of politics (with the Exodus); and the de-consecration of values (with the Sinai Covenant). The "shame" (anonymity and mobility) and the "style" (pragmatism and profanity) of the secu-

lar city are discussed before Cox takes his readers on a "Cook's Tour" of *tecnopolis* in India, Western and Eastern Europe and the United States.

The Church in the Secular City is a discussion of the need for and outline of a "theology of social change". The Church (*laos theou*) as God's *avant-garde* is "first of all a responding community, a people whose task it is to discern the action of God in the world and to join in His work". The Church's function is essentially three-fold: (a) the Church's *kerygmatic* function is to broadcast "what God is doing in history . . . liberating people from bondage, releasing them from political, cultural, and economic captivity, providing them with the occasion to forge in the wilderness a new symbol system, a new set of values, and a new national identity"; (b) the Church's *diakonic* function is to be "the servant and the healer of the city . . . healing and reconciling, binding up wounds and bridging chasms . . . (by purveying) the healing forces which God, working with man, sets loose in the city"; and (c) the Church's *koinonic* function is to give "a visible demonstration of what the church is saying in its *kerygma* and pointing to in its *diakonia* . . . a kind of living picture of the character and composition of the true city of man for which the church strives".

Excursions in Urban Exorcism relates the insights for which Cox has argued to three spheres of man's life in the secular city — namely, work and play, sex, and the university. The church's ministry in these spheres must be guided by Jesus' work of exorcism which was "in no way peripheral, but stood at the heart of his work". New Testament men used the language of demons — "principalities and powers" — to designate sub-personal forces and suprapersonal influences which warped and twisted human life. This language reflected the culture of the times and, as anthropologists have discovered, "culture has a powerful effect on persons . . . a person whose whole view of himself includes the cultural meanings inherent in a magical society will literally die if that culture indicates he should". Thus "cultural exorcism" is the pattern for the church's ministry in the secular city where "massive residues of magical and superstitious world-views remain". Repressed and projected feelings and the romantic fallacy create stereotyped responses to work and play, sex and the university; and it is the church's responsibility "to be a cultural exorcist, casting out the mythical meanings that obscure the realities of life and hinder human action".

God and the Secular Man is an attempt to speak in a secular fashion of God. Here Cox is "both tempted and tormented" by Bonhoeffer's questions of April 3, 1944 — "How do you speak of God without religion . . . How do we speak in a secular fashion of God?"

Pointing out that biblical faith must *speak* of God, Cox examines Bonhoeffer's thesis in three parts — as a sociological problem, a political issue and a theological question. In his enquiry he is guided by the conviction that "Jesus Christ comes to his people not primarily through ecclesiastical traditions, but through social change". And in the "abrasive experiences of social change . . . God reveals his name to man". Thus, Cox argues, "the difference between men of biblical faith and serious nontheists is not that we do not encounter the same reality. The difference is that we give that reality a different *name*, and in naming it differently, we differ seriously in the way we respond." At this time when "the word *God* means almost nothing to modern secular man" we cannot simply conjure up a new name. "Rather than clinging stubbornly to antiquated appellations or anxiously synthesizing new ones, perhaps, like Moses, we must simply take up the work of liberating the captives confident that we will be granted a new name by events of the future".

TECNOPOLIS IN SOUTH AFRICA

"*The Secular City*" provokes, stimulates, exhilarates, angers, confuses, clarifies, synthesises, destroys, challenges, comforts, disturbs . . . but never *boreds*. It does not have the answer to a host of problems and some of its answers (especially in the fourth part) are downright wrong. But it rings true, and is not afraid to explore *tecnopolis* and claim it for Jesus of Nazareth. And it is a book with which every Christian in South Africa must come to terms — not because of its answers, but because of the problems it discusses "in theological perspective".

Secularization and urbanization are also catching South African Christians "on the hop". For example, in the August issue of *Die Hervormer*, Dr. J. I. de Wet drew attention to a fact every minister of the Gospel (clerical or lay) has encountered — namely, that both "inside" and "outside" the Church less and less people understand words like "grace", "faith", "salvation", "justification", "sanctification", "confession of faith". In drawing attention to this fact Dr. de Wet has done the whole Church a service. But I very much doubt whether his diagnosis of the disease is as accurate as his observation of it. "Inadequate catechism instruction", "wrong preaching" and "irresponsible pastoral work" are as much *symptoms* of a diseased Church as is a lack of comprehension and belief on the part of those who hear the Church's language. And in such a situation Christians must learn to "search the Scriptures" and "do the truth". "*The Secular City*" will help them in their searching and doing. — J.E.M.

BOEKBESPREKING

THE PULPIT SPEAKS ON RACE

"The Pulpit Speaks on Race". 'n Versameling van preke deur twintig bekende Amerikaanse Evangeliedienaars van verskillende kerkgenootskappe. Abington Press, New York and Nashville. Prys: \$3.95.

Onder die name van die twintig leraars wie se preke hier opgeneem is, vind ons van die mees welbekende kerklike figure wat die afgelope jare leiding geneem het in die V.S.A. om 'n Christelike getuienis insake rasseverhoudinge te lewer: Eugene Carson Blake, William Sloane Coffin, Jr., David G. Colwell, Joseph W. Ellwanger, Martin Luther King, Bruce William Klunder, Thomas Kilgore, Jr., Gardner Taylor en Everett Tilson. Sommige van die boodskappe is nie preke in dié sin waarin Gereformeerde kringe dit verstaan nie, aangesien nie almal 'n bepaalde teks kies, uitleë en toepas nie. Dit sou dus meer korrek gewees het om die bundel as preke en geleentheidsredes aan te dui, maar dit neem niks weg van die skerpte en die erns van die uitdaging vervat in die aangebode stof nie.

Gewoonlik word die Amerikaanse kerke en Christene in sommige politieke en kerklike kringe aangedui as mense wat hulle mond vol het van kritiek en veroordeling op rasseverhoudinge in Suid-Afrika en ander lande van die wêreld. Wel, wie dit in dié bundel gaan soek, sal teleurgesteld wees want dit bied presies die teenoorgestelde — 'n meedoënlose, diepgevoelende, eerlike selfkritiek op die getuienis van die kerk in die V.S.A. oor rasseverhoudinge. Hier beluister ons die stem van die gewete van twintig blank- en negerchristene wat soek om hulle dienste Christelike voortuiginge uit te spreek oor die rassesituasie in hulle eie kerkgenootskappe en in hulle land. Sommige van die preke is meer beskrywend en feit-opsommend van aard, maar 'n ons of aet van die twintig preke weerstaan 'n diepgevoelende voorafgaande ontleding van Bybelse waarhede en begrippe om tot innerlike klaarheid te kom.

Die leraar en lidmaat in Suid-Afrika wat anesvallig wil vasklou 'n baie van sy tradisionele sieninge en houdinge insake ras met afwysing van die uitdaging van die Skrif, moet hiewer nie dié bundel lees nie. Wie sy valse gemoedsrus wil behou, wie nie innerlik uitgedaag wil word en sy gewete nie wil laat ontwaak en meesprek met Gods Woord nie, moet hiewer die boek vermy. Maar wie eerlik soek om te wil verstaan hoe Christenleiers in die V.S.A. op grond van hulle Bybelse insigte die rassesituasie benader, sal in hierdie preke en boodskappe baie stimulerende en uitdagende gedagtes vind.

Ons eksegete en teoloe in Suid-Afrika sal ernstig (en soms heftig) verskil oor die eksegetiese en ander uitsprake in sommige preke, maar een feit tref 'n mens in byna elke preek: die duidelikheid en direktheid waarmee die prediker die Bybelse waarheid soos hy dit sien en verstaan, toepas op die situasie in die V.S.A. 'n Mens sou wat wil gee as meer predikante hier in Suid-Afrika na die voorbeeld van dié manne hulle preke se

toepassing baie meer pertinent wil betrek op bepaalde gebeurtenisse en op aktuele situasies en nie maar net by mooi-klinkende maar vae algemene waarhede wil bly vassteek nie, uit vrees dat 'n deurtrek van die waarheid na die praktyk hulle dalk hulle preekstoel gaan kos!

Dit moelik om bepaalde preke uit te sonder, maar vir Suid-Afrikaanse lesers sal die preke van Martin Luther King ("Love in Action"), Joseph W. Ellwanger ("God's plan: to unite all things in Christ"), Everett Tilson ("Segregation and the ten Commandments"), Thomas Kilgore, Jr. ("Segregation, discrimination and the Christian Church"), en Robert B. McNeill ("That you may have integrity") op 'n besondere manier aanspreek. Sommige lesers sal die predikers vervloek, ander sal hulle vereer. Maar wat u ookal doen, is die wesenlike saak dat u erken dat die Woord van God 'n duidelik-verstaanbare boodskap het oor alle rasse- en menslike verhoudinge, nie net in die V.S.A. nie, maar ook in Suid-Afrika. As net een preek uit die twintig u terugding na u Bybel en na u naaste, was die publikasie van die bundel in alle opsigte die moeite werd.

— BEYERS NAUDÉ.

KORTE DOGMATIEK

Prof. Dr. K. Dijk, *Korte Dogmatiek*, No's. 76-77 in „Boeketreeks”, Uitg. J. H. Kok N.V., Kampen, 312 bl.

Die bekende gereformeerde teoloog, oud-hoogleraar van die Theologiese Hogeschool te Kampen, het met sy „Korte Dogmatiek” 'n diens van onskatbare waarde aan die Kerk bewys. Die Dogmatiek het in hierdie werk die lesingsaal van die universiteit verlaat om onder die mense van elke dag in te kom. Daaraan is daar 'n dringende behoefte. Die boek van prof. Dijk herinner, wat sy titel en doelstelling betref, sterk aan die *Kleine Dogmatiek* van Van Niftrik, wat ook in Suid-Afrika 'n dankbare ontvangs geniet het. Dit is egter, sowel wat die stof as wat die benadering betref, heeltemal verskillend. Daarom is hierdie twee werke nie ten opsigte van mekaar oorvleuelend nie, maar aanvullend.

Prof. Dijk verdeel sy boek in 'n historiese en 'n teïese deel. In die historiese deel kry ons 'n oorsig van die verskillende rigtinge op die uitgebreide terrein van die dogmatiek gedurende die hele geskiedenis van die Christelike Kerk. Teen hierdie agtergrond gee die skrywer dan 'n teïese uiteensetting van die dogmatiese stof in aansluiting aan die gereformeerde belydenisskrifte. Hoewel die skrywer polemiëk sover moontlik wou vermy (wat veral in 'n dogmatiese werk die uiterste selfbeheersing verg) gaan hy hom m.i. tog te buite aan Barth as hy, sonder om dit te motiveer, hom die oordeel laat ontval dat die teologie van Barth op meer as een punt nie met die Skrif ooreenstem nie en meer 'n wysgerige konstruksie is as 'n eg-teologiese weergawe van die Bybelse gegewens. As 'n uitvoerige staving van sy oordeel nie binne die bestek van 'n Korte Dogmatiek

ingepas kon word nie, moes die skrywer hiewer ook die opmerking verswyg het. Die prominensie van Barth as teoloog en die bekendheid van sy naam ook by die man-op-straat, wat hierdie nuttige werk hopelik ook sal lees, sou egter 'n paar bladsye oor sy denke geregverdig het en 'n verantwoording deur die skrywer van sy oordeel.

'n Slothoofstuk waarin die skrywer aantoon hoe die dogmatiese stof, soos dit in die boek behandel is, inpas in die Drie Formuliere van Enigheid, is besonder nuttig. So ook 'n naam-, saak- en teksregister aan die einde van die boek. Mag Korte Dogmatiek in ons land net so goed ontvang word as sy ouer broer van Hervormde kant, *Kleine Dogmatiek!*

— B.F.

DE OPENBARING VAN JOHANNES

Dr. A. J. Visser, *De Openbaring van Johannes*, in die reeks „De prediking van het Nieuwe Testament”, Uitg. G. F. Callenbach N.V., Nijkerk, 1965: 267 bl. (plus literatuurlys en register).

Kenmerkend van die kommentare reeks, *De prediking van het Nieuwe Testament*, is dat dit 'n hoë wetenskaplike gehalte paar met boeiende skryftrant en maklike styl, sodat dit ook vir die leser wat nie teologies geskool is nie, toeganklik is. Om die rede hoop 'n mens dat daar in wêreld kringe as die studeerkamers van predikante daarvan gebruik gemaak word. Twaalf dele het reeds verskyn, agt dele is in voorbereiding, en daarmee is dan die hele Nuwe Testament, met uitsondering van die Evangelie volgens Mattheüs, gedek. Elke predikant wat hierdie reeks aanskaf, sal gou ontdek dat dit, met die oog op preekvoorbereiding, van die kosbaarste en nuttigste kommentare is wat hy maar op sy rak kan hê.

Dr. Visser het 'n besonder waardige bydrae tot die reeks gelewer met sy kommentaar op die Openbaring van Johannes. In 'n „praecambulum” bespreek die skrywer 'n aantal metodes van uitleg van Openbaring: Die tydhistoriese, die eindhistoriese (sommige vertaal dit tog so uit die Duits, bv. G. Sevenster in sy „Christologie van het N.T.”), die kerkhistoriese, die godsdiensthistoriese, die psigologies-mistieke, die „suiwer kerygmatische”. Hy kies nie een daarvan nie, oordeel in elk geval dat die kerkhistoriese en konsekwent-eindhistoriese uitleg verwerp moet word vanweë die feit dat dit van die digterlike profesie van Johannes „waarsêery” maak, en meen dat die ideaal behoort te wees om 'n sintese van die waardevolste elemente van elk van die metodes te kry. Tog erken hy later weer 'n „sekere stuk waarheid” ook in die „eindhistoriese” uitleg van Openbaring (bl. 234). Johannes se boek (dr. Visser ag die outeursvraag, nl. of die skrywer Johannes, die seun van Sebedeüs of dit die presbyter Papias was, onbetreft, bl. 19) bevat prediking vir sy tydgenote, geklee in beelde wat hulle wel verstaan het. Dit is „exhortatio ad martyrium”. Die gemeente in verdrukking word versterk in die sekerheid dat Jesus reeds oorwin het, en tegelyk word sy ge-

(Vervolg op bladsy 16)

(Vervolg van bladsy 15)

loof op die toekoms gerig: Die toekoms sal hierdie sekerheid bevestig. Openbaring, die tema van hierdie boek, is dit dat die sluier weggetrek word wat die geheimenis van die Godsryk — die teenwoordige en die komende Ryk — bedek. As sodanig val dit geheel en al binne die kader van die „prediking van die Nuwe Testament” en bly sy boodskap ook vir die hede aktueel.

Met sy beskouing van die Antichris as 'n Nero redivivus (waaroor daar volgens dr. Visser geen twyfel kan bestaan nie) het Johannes hom vergis. Tog bly sy getuigenis waar in die diepste sin van die woord. Die verwagting van 'n nabye wederkoms van Christus, het hy met die ander Nuwe Testamentiese skrywers gedeel. Die vergissing hieromtrent, by Johannes skerper omlin vanweë sy konkrete verwagtinge, doen egter niks af aan die waarheid van sy prediking nie. „Die Nero redivivus wat Johannes sien aankom het, het nie gekom nie, maar talryke weer tot lewe geroepe Nero's het in die loop van die eeue verskyn. En die sekerheid van Christus se oorwinning, al is dit in 'n ander vorm as wat die man van Patmos verwag het, is in die geloof net so reël. Dit gaan om die kern van die boodskap: die konkrete verwagtinge van Johannes in die laaste helfte van die eerste eeu, is die vorm waarin hierdie Evangelie van God se gestrengte barmhartigheid aan ons gebring word” (bl. 233).

Dr. Visser het o.i. goed daarin geslaag om in sy uitleg van Openbaring duidelik te laat hoor hoe die sentrale boodskap van die Nuwe Testament daarin deurklink. Mag hierdie kommentaar daartoe bydra dat daar meer preke uit Openbaring van die kansels gehoor sal word.

— B. E.

ALTYD TRIOMFEREND

F. J. Huegel. „Altyd Triomferend”. Die geheim van oorwinning in die Christelike lewe. Uit die Engels vertaal deur Timo Kriel. Christelike Uitgewersmaatskappy, Roodepoort, 83 bl. Prys R1.40.

'n Mens kan hierdie boekie ook 'n loflied op die Evangelie noem. Die skrywer, wat gedurende die Eerste Wêreldoorlog as kapelaan gedien het, daarna sendingwerk in Mexiko gedoen het, en hom ook gewy het aan evangeliesasiewerk in gevangnisse, doseer tans aan die Union-seminarie in Mexiko-stad. In „Altyd Triomferend” is 'n prediker aan die woord wat die bevrydende klanke van die Evangelie met diepe erns en tog met groot eenvoud uitspreek. Die „enigste Naam”, Jesus Christus, sal die hart van elkeen wat dit lees met nuwe dankbaarheid vervul. Dit is sy oorwinning, waarvan die gelowiges deelgenote is, wat in hierdie boekie besing word. „Nee, die Christen veg nie vir 'n moontlike oorwinning nie. Hy is meer as oorwinnaar, omdat sy lewe uit die triomfantlike dood en onstanding van die Here Jesus Christus vloei” (bl. 37).

'n Spitsvondige verklaring van die getal 153 in die Evangelieberig van die wonderlike visvangs, is enigsinshinderlik (bl. 15).

Ons wil die boekie van harte aanbe-

veel. Dit lees besonder maklik, die vertaler het hom goed van sy taak gekwyt, en die uitgewers het die uitgawe goed versorg.

— B. E.

WÊRELDVEROWERING

Paul B. Smith, „Wêreldverowering”. Uit die Engels vertaal deur Timo Kriel. Christelike Uitgewersmaatskappy, Roodepoort, 126 bl. Prys R1.25.

In 'n vyftiental kort, pakkende opstelle, almal met opskrifte in teenstellinge geformuleer, stel die skrywer die uitdaging wat die wêreld vir die kerk en die Christendom inhou. Nugter en prakties word in die boekie sekere probleme i.v.m. wêreldewangelisasie en sending aan die orde gestel, en sonder omhaal van woorde praat die skrywer oor die slagspreuke wat die Christelike aksie behoort te mo-

tiveer, die geld wat vir hierdie aksie nodig is en die kenmerke van die ware sendeling. In Deel II, „Die Geld wat die Masjinerie Laat Loop”, gee die hoofstukopskrifte al 'n duidelike aanduiding van hoe eerlik en op die punt af die skrywer praat. Wat die wêreldewangelisasie tans die nodigste het, is „nie mense nie, maar geld” (7); ons kan ons taak egter nie uitstel totdat die kontant daarvoor beskikbaar is nie, daarom is die metode „nie kontant nie, maar krediet” (8); God vra, wat ons bydraes betref „nie liefdadigheid nie, maar ons beste” (9); „nie tiendes nie, maar alles” (10).

Dit is die moeite werd om 'n paar uur aan die deurlees van hierdie boekie af te staan. Sy inhoud sal die leser by-bly. Ook die vertaler en die uitgewers het hulle goed van hul taak gekwyt.

— B. E.

International standard urged to guarantee religious liberty

The development of an international standard of religious liberty which would not be subject to the restrictions of existing national constitutions and laws was urged in a resolution adopted by the Executive Committee of the Commission of the Churches on International Affairs (CCIA) in annual session in Geneva.

„Every effort should be made to cause national constitutions and laws to conform to the international standard,” the Committee declared.

The development of the international standard was one of seven “essential requirements” for religious liberty listed in the resolution by the 11-member committee of church foreign affairs experts.

These were the seven “essential requirements” for religious liberty listed by the Committee resolution:

1. While holding a distinctive Christian basis for religious liberty, the civil freedom which Christians claim for themselves must be guaranteed to all men everywhere, whatever their resolution or belief.
2. Religious liberty includes freedom to change one's religion or belief without consequent social, economic, and political disabilities. Implicit in this right is the right freely to maintain one's belief or disbelief without external coercion or disability.
3. Religious liberty further includes freedom to manifest religion or belief. Worship, teaching, practice, and observance are essential forms of religious

manifestation, and any elaboration of the standard of religious liberty must expressly provide for them.

4. To every person there should be assured the right to manifest his religion or belief, whether alone or in community, and in the public or private.
5. Religious liberty also includes freedom to maintain individual or collective bonds with religious communities or associations, the character of which transcends national boundaries. It also includes freedom to express opinions or convictions and to impart information and ideas through any media and regardless of frontiers.
6. The standard of religious liberty should be international. The international standard should not be restrictively interpreted to make it conform to existing national constitutions and laws, but every effort should be made to cause national constitutions and laws to conform to the international standard.
7. The exercise of religious freedom as well as that of other civil rights may be subject to such limitations as are determined by law solely in the interest of public order. Religious rights shall be available for all without discrimination on grounds of religion or belief.”

Quoted from the World Council of Churches INFORMATION LETTER dated 16th July, 1965.