

Love versus hate	1
Gevaarlike woorde	1
Editorial/Redaksioneel	3
Meditation	3
Books for Africa	3
Die grense van nasionalisme	4
Politics has no answer	5
Vooruitsigte vir die kerk in N.R.	6
What is a Christian	7
The Church in the world	8

CHRISTELIKE MAANDBLAD VIR SUIDELIKE AFRIKA

CHRISTIAN MONTHLY FOR SOUTHERN AFRICA

Jaargang II; Nr. 7

Intekengeld R2 Subscription

Nov. 15 Nov. 1963

Volume II; No. 7

By die Hoofposkantoor as nuusblad geregistreer.

Registered at the Post Office as a Newspaper

Prof. G. McLead Bryan*

THE STRENGTH TO LOVE versus THE URGE TO HATE

The racial revolution America is undergoing momentarily is led by two Negroes, both sons of clergymen and themselves sometimes clergymen; yet they are leading in opposite directions.

James Baldwin, whose book *The Fire Next Time* has been the top best-seller for forty weeks, expresses his disgust for democracy and Christianity. The very title of his book is taken from a vindictive Negro spiritual whose lines read

God gave to Noah the rainbow sign:

No more water, the fire next time. Martin Luther King, Jr. has written a book entitled *The Strength to Love* which amplifies his conviction that the Jesus-way of nonviolent protest and love for the white man is the way to overcome the evil of segregation. King writes that he knows many black people "have lost faith in America, have absolutely repudiated Christianity, and have concluded that the white man is an incurable 'devil'." Nonetheless, he believes that there is good left in all men, even whites, and that suffering love, heroic, patient, and nonviolent, will melt their hearts in the end.

But at the moment Baldwin's voice in America is louder than King's, giving more possibility to the dire prophecy of John Brown who died a hundred years ago to end slavery: "I am certain that this guilty nation will not be purged except by blood". Baldwin seems to be completely disillusioned with the American Dream: "The American dream has therefore become something much more closely resembling a nightmare..."

King has suffered too, and confesses from a jail-cell in Georgia that "shattered dreams are the hallmark of our mortal life". Still he does not resort to hate. "Hate", he writes, "is just as injurious to the person who hates. Like an unchecked cancer, hate corrodes the personality and eats away its vital unity. Hate destroys a man's sense of values and his objectivity."

Baldwin's Embittered Reaction

On the other hand, Baldwin's books comprise a litany of hate. As one encounters him in his writings one is impressed by his concentrating on hate, his low estimate of the white man, his tragic sense of life, his embittered realism, his disillusionment with the church, Christianity and re-

ligion, his frank denial of God. He can write nothing without being pre-possessed with racism. The artist in him is pushed aside while he seizes writing merely as a vehicle to ride out his hate. "And there is, I should think, no Negro living in America who has not felt, briefly or for long periods, with anguish sharp or dull, in varying degrees and to varying effect, simple, naked and unanswerable hatred; who has not wanted to smash any white face he may encounter in a day, to violate, out of motives of the cruelest vengeance, their women, to break the bodies of all white people and bring them low, as low as that dust into which he himself has been and is being trampled." That, mind

you, is a quotation from the best-selling book in America at the moment!

King's Moral Appeal

But King calls for the moral response, to rely upon God and trust in His salvation; "Our age-old and noble dream of a world of peace may yet become a reality, but it will come neither by man working alone nor by God destroying the wicked schemes of men, but when men so open their lives to God that He may fill them with love, mutual respect, understanding, and goodwill. Social salvation will come only through man's willing acceptance of God's mighty gift."

Two People — Two Approaches

Now we come to the heart of the matter: how could two Negroes about

the same age, subject to the same common indignities of race prejudice, emerge so far apart in outlook and procedure? Baldwin's God failed him; King's God sustains him. Baldwin moved consecutively away from God; King has drawn closer to God: "The agonizing moments through which I have passed during the last few years (thrown in jail twelve times!) have drawn me closer to God." For Baldwin religion is a delusion, a racket alongside other rackets, and Christianity "a legend". For King, Christianity is the source of all good including the current racial protest: "It was Jesus of Nazareth that stirred the Negroes to protest with the creative weapon of love." Baldwin's church was a fake: "I left the church twenty years ago... I really mean that there was no love in the church." King pays the Negro Church its highest compliment: "I'm grateful to God that, through the Negro church, the dimension of non-violence entered our struggle."

Mystery and Miracle

After all explanations of their differences, we confront a mystery, perhaps a miracle. Otherwise how can we explain Baldwin and King — thrown into the same washing machi-

(cont. on page 2)

Prof. A. van Selms

Gevaarlike woorde

I. Filantropie

Bepaalde woorde het in die loop van die tyd so 'n ongunstige klank gekry, dat die enkele vermelding daarvan partymaal voldoende is om 'n saak te veroordeel. Die meeste mense beoordeel 'n saak mos nie volgens sy eie waarde nie, maar laat hulle lei deur wat daarvoor gesê of geskryf is. Met bepaalde woorde kan die goeioefende swartsmeerder allerlei verdienstelike sake verongeluk sonder dat hy selfs die moeite hoef te neem om na redelike gronde vir sy veroordeling te soek.

Dergelike woorde is gevaarlik: want hulle is wapens in die hande van gewetenlose mense. Maar dergelike woorde kan ook gevaarlik word vir dié wat hulle gebruik. Want enige wapen kan hom keer teen diegene wat dit op 'n ander rig. „Almal wat die swaard neem, sal deur die swaard vergaan”, lees ons in Matth. 26 : 52. Hierdie woord is ook van toepassing op geestelike gebied.

Oorspronklike betekenis gunstig

Hierdie keer wil ons dit aantoon aan die hand van die woord filantropie. Van huis uit het daardie woord 'n gunstige klank gehad. Dit het weldadigheid beteken, en wel weldadigheid op 'n groot skaal. Dit was geen filantropie om 'n stuiwer in die armebeurs te doen nie, maar wel om 'n groot som opsy te sit uit die rente waarvan die onderrig bv. aan doo-

stomme bekostig is. Dit het van priaatpersone gekom wie se hart bewoë was oor die ellende wat in die besonder deur die minvermoëndes gely is. Alhierdie instellings in Europa dra nog altyd die naam „Filantropiese” of wel „Christelik-Filantropiese inrigting vir...”

Kritiek — van Marxistiese kant

Tog onthou ek dat ook in my jeug daar reeds kritiek op filantropiese arbeid geopen is. Dit het van prinsipiële Marxistiese kant gekom. Volgens die teorie van Marx moes die toestand van die handarbeiders steeds slegter word, totdat die ellende ten slotte so ondraaglik sou wees, dat 'n revolusie wel moes uitbreek. Elke vorm van weldadigheid, so is deur die aanhangers van Marx beweer, was 'n vertraging van daardie „Verelendings”-proses en daarom verwerplik. Vandaar

dat die kommuniste in die twintiger jare, en vermoedelik reeds lank daarvoor, vir filantropie niks anders as hoon en veragting oorgehad het nie.

Dit is wel merkwaardig dat daardie hoon en veragting in ons dae nog steeds gehoor word, maar nou van anti-kommunistiese kant. In kerklike organe lees 'n mens dikwels, altans in hierdie land, geringskattende opmerkings oor „filantropie”, waaronder dan verstaan word manne of vroue, wat hulle liefde en bystand gelyklik en sonder om onderskeid te maak op blank en nie-blank rig.

So het die woord hier en nou omtrent dieselfde betekenis as „kafferboetie” gekry — net so 'n gevaarlike woord wat ook 'n keer afsonderlik behandel behoort te word. As iemand die geluk van sy medemens sonder onderskeid wil bevorder, as iemand gelyke regte vir almal wat regte kan dra bepleit, as iemand in elkeer in die eerste plaas sy medemens en sy naaste sien — dan sal dit nie lank duur of hy word 'n humanis, 'n liberalis en 'n filantroop genoem, en waar hierdie name val, is die verdagmaking van kommunisme nie meer ver nie.

(vervolg op bladsy 2)

The strength to love

(cont. from page 1)

ne, using the same brand of suds, yet emerging with shades so clearly discernable?

"Do I sound like most preachers — idealistic and impractical?" asks King. "Maybe in some distant Utopia, you say, that idea will work, but not in the hard, cold world in which we live. My friends, we have followed the so-called practical way for too long a time now, and it has led to deeper confusion and chaos... While abhorring segregation, we shall love the segregationist. Far from being the pious injunction of a Utopian dreamer, the command to love one's enemy is an absolute necessity for our survival. Love even for enemies is the key to the solution of the problem of our world. Jesus is not an impractical idealist; he is the practical realist."

No, through the strength of love infused into his life through Jesus Christ, Martin Luther King, Jr. refuses to hate. Instead he expects his black followers to be superhuman, to rise above the low level of the oppressive whites, to lay hold of the true principles of democracy, to practice nonviolence, to be partners with God

in His suffering redemption that we all may avert Doom's Day. "The Negro must convince the white man that he seeks justice for both himself and the white man." He conceives of his spiritual leadership as a way to save the world from the catastrophe of a race war. "Our present suffering and our nonviolent struggle to be free may well offer to Western civilization the kind of spiritual dynamic so desperately needed for survival... Historians will have to say, 'There lived a great people — a black people — who injected new meaning and dignity into the veins of civilization.'"

The West can be thankful to God that such a leader has been produced by its own moral agony, to offset the hate-mongers. That fact in itself is not enough to save us, but it should give us the strength to love rather than the urge to hate.

* G. McLeod Bryan is Associate Professor of Christian Social Ethics at Wake Forest College, Winston-Salem, North Carolina, U.S.A. and has an extensive knowledge of the Christian struggle in Africa.

Gevaarlike woorde

(vervolg van bladsy 1)

Filantropie — 'n Bybelse woord

Wat die uitdelers van hierdie soort van kwalifikasies gewoonlik nie besef nie, is dat die woord filantropie en sy afleidings 'n Bybelse woord is. Eén wat 'n mondjievol Grieks geleer het, kan weet dat dit „mense liefde” beteken, en elkeen wat sy Bybel enigermate ken, weet dat daardie woord driemaal in die Nuwe Testament voorkom. Hoe nuttig sou dit wees as ons skrywers in die kerklike pers, alvorens allerlei „gevaarlike” woorde te gebruik, eers hulle Bybel ten aanskyn van daardie woorde sou raadpleeg! Ons kry die indruk dat baie van ons teoloë of kwasi-teoloë baie min aan Bybelstudie doen. By die koerantgeskryf oor Sondagsheiliging of oor evolusie gedurende die laaste maande kon 'n mens telkens weer daardie opmerking maak.

Daarom sal dit wel goed wees as ons 'n oomblik stilstaan by die drie tekste uit die Nuwe Testament, waarin die woord mense liefde, filantropie, voorkom. In 'n kerk wat hom op die Woord van God grondves, behoort niks belangriker en beslissender te wees as Bybelstudie nie. Laat ons dus sien waar en hoe die Heilige Skrif die woord filantropie of mense liefde gebruik, en op grond daarvan ons afvra of ons die reg het om die woord in diskwalifiserende betekenis te gebruik.

Eerste Tekst: Hand. 27 : 3

Die eerste tekst, waar ons die woord vind, is Hand. 27 : 3. Paulus is saam met ander gevangenes oorgegee aan die offisier Julius, wat gedurende die reis daarvoor verantwoordelik was dat sy gevangenes nie sou ontsnap nie. Hoe swaar hierdie verantwoordelikheid was, kan ons aflei uit Hand. 16 : 27: toe die sipier van Filippi dink dat sy gevangenes ontsnap het, wou hy selfmoord pleeg; of uit Hand. 12 : 19: wagt wie se gevangene ontsnap het, is tereggestel. Nietemin het Julius aan Paulus toestemming verleen om, toe die skip waarmee hulle gery het, in

Sidon aankom, daar vriende te besoek en hom deur hulle te laat versorg. Met die oog daarop sê Lukas: „En Julius het Paulus mensliwend behandel”. Hy het daardie optrede van die heidense amptenaar geprys. In die reisverhaal van Hand. 27 word Julius herhaaldelik by name genoem, terwyl stuurman en eienaar van die skip (vers 11) ongenoem bly. So word aan Julius die belofte van Mark. 9 : 41 vervul, en ons mag aanneem dat hy ook in die hiernamaals sy loon sekerlik nie verloor het nie.

Tweede Tekst: Hand. 28 : 2

Die tweede tekst is Hand. 28 : 2. As die skipbreukelinge, waaronder Paulus en sy metgeselle, swemmend of drywend op wrakhout aan wal kom, ondervind hulle van die kant van die inboorlinge (die Grieks het „barbare”, ook al weer so 'n „gevaarlike” woord!) van Malta „buitengewone mensliwendheid”. Dikwils is in die oudheid skipbreukelinge vermoor en hulle laaste besittings gesteel. Wat aanspoel uit die see is as eiendom van die bewoners van die kus beskou.

Ourlang's het ons by geleentheid van die stranding van die „Aimee Lykes” by Scottburg gesien, dat 'n deel van ons bevolking nog daardie opvatting toegedaan is. Maar die barbare of inboorlinge van Malta word deur die Heilige Skrif geprys om hulle „buitengewone mensliwendheid”: hulle het nie na ras of nasionaliteit gevra nie, maar eenvoudig en volywerig gehelp om die deurweekte en klappertandende skipbreukelinge van die nodige te voorsien.

Derde Tekst: Titus 3 : 4

En nou die derde tekst, en nou word dit buitengewoon ernstig. Want tot nou toe het dit oor mense gegaan, maar nou gaan dit oor God. In Titus 3 : 4 lees ons: „Maar toe die goedertierenheid van God, ons Verlosser, en sy liefde tot die mens verskyn het...” As u geen Grieks ken nie, glo my dan

VERSKONING

Die Redaksie bied hiermee sy verskoning aan aan die lesers van ons blad vir die feit dat die afgelope twee uitgawes nie betyds verskyn het nie. Dit was te wyte aan omstandighede wat buite ons beheer was maar wat nou reggestel is sodat ons blad vanaf Desember weer soos gewoonlik op die 15e van elke maand kan verskyn. Ons vestig die aandag van alle lesers op die kennisgewing insake toekomstige verspreiding van ons blad wat elders in hierdie uitgawe verskyn.

APOLOGY

The Editorial Board herewith tender its apology to the readers of our paper for the fact that the last two issues did not appear in time. This was due to circumstances outside our control which have now been rectified. Our paper will therefore appear as normal on the 15th of each month from December. We draw your attention to the notice regarding future distribution appearing elsewhere in this issue.

KENNISGEWING

Hierdie uitgawe is die laaste wat gratis gegee word aan persone wat nie op die blad ingeteken het nie af wat nie te kenne gegee het dat hulle dit nog graag verder gratis wil ontvang nie. Vanaf Desember sal die blad ook te koop wees by die C.N.A.-boekhandel asook by Christelike of Kerklike boekhandels wat onderneem het om die verspreiding daarvan waar te neem. Ingeval u los kopieë wil kry en dit nie by die betrokke takke van die C.N.A. of die Christelike of Kerklike boekhandel beskikbaar is nie, versoek hulle dan asseblief om die nodige reëling te tref om gereed los kopieë vir verkoop beskikbaar te hou.

NOTICE

This issue would be the last to be posted free of charge to readers who have not subscribed to our paper or who did not indicate that they would like to receive further free copies. As from December copies will be available at the C.N.A. branches as well as Christian or Church bookshops who have undertaken to assist in the distribution of the paper. Should you find copies unobtainable at certain branches of the C.N.A., Christian or Church bookshops, please request them to make the necessary arrangements to have copies available for sale.

op my woord, of laat dit kontroleer deur iemand wat dit wel ken, daar is duisendes in die land: hier staan letterlik: „die goedertierenheid en die filantropie van God, onse Verlosser”.

En waaruit bestaan daardie filantropie van God? Die volgende twee verse sê dit met onmiskenbare woorde: ons redding deur die wedergeboorte en die gawe van die Heilige Gees op grond van die versoeningswerk van Jesus Christus. Met ander woorde, die hele heilswerk, deur die Drieënige God vir ons en aan ons verig, word saamgevat in daardie woord „filantropie”, „mense liefde”.

„Wees dan navolgers van God soos geliefde kinders”, sê die apostel (Ef. 5 : 1). Ons sien nou, watter betekenis die Bybel aan woorde soos filantropie en filantroop heg; wie is ons dan om in smadelike sin te gebruik, wat in die Woord van God 'n ere naam is en die samevatting van die heilswerk van God, waaraan ons saligheid hang? Wil ons dan God weerspreek? Wil ons ons hoon uitstort oor dit wat deur Hom geprys word? Vrees ons nie vir die oordeel wat opgesluit lê in Ps. 18 : 26, 27 nie? Daar staan mos: „By die liefderike betoon U uself liefderik, by die opregte man opreg, by die reine rein; maar by die valse betoon U uself verkeerd”. Watter mentaliteit skuil agter die smadelike gebruik van die benaming filantroop deur die teoloog? Sal die Here miskien ook nie

vir hom moet sê nie (Matth. 20 : 15): „Of is jou oog verkeerd, omdat ek goed is?”

Sien, hoe gevaarlik is hierdie woord! Dis die minste nog dat u daarmee mense en sake verdoem het; dit blyk dat dit 'n goddelike woord is, 'n woord uit die Heilige Skrif, wat teen u gekeer kan word op die dag van die oordeel! ★

PRO VERITATE

Published the 15th of each month.

Correspondence; Administration: Address all letters for the Editor and Administration to P.O. Box 487, Johannesburg.

Editorial Committee: Prof. Dr. J. C. G. Kotzé, Rev. E. E. Mahabane, Rev. R. Orr, Prof. Dr. A. van Selms and Rev. J. W. Wessels.

Editor: Rev. C. F. B. Naudé.

Subscription: Republic of South Africa, S.W. A., Rhodesias and Protectorates: R2 per year, payable in advance. Overseas: R2.50 per year in advance.

Cheques and Postal Orders must be made out in the name of „Pro Veritate”, (Pty.) Ltd. „Pro Veritate” is printed by the Potchefstroom Herald (Pty.) Ltd., Olën Lane, Potchefstroom.

PRO VERITATE

EDITORIAL

THEOLOGIANS MEET IN STUDY AND PRAYER

From the 4th until the 27th January 1964 between 30 and 50 professors and lecturers of the various theological seminaries and faculties in South Africa will meet at the Priory of Christ the King, Rosettenville, Johannesburg for the second Theological Staff Institute course to be held in South Africa. The first course was held at Stutterheim in the beginning of this year and all the participants agreed that this encounter was of great significance to the interchurch relations in our country. The aim of such courses, made possible by grants of the Theological Education Fund, are to give added equipment to the tutors of future non-white theological ministers.

The main theme at the second course will be Christian Theology and the Contemporary Religions in Africa and the lecturers will be Professor J. H. Bavinck of the Vrije Universiteit, Amsterdam; Dr. W. A. Bijleveld of Jos, Nigeria (well-known expert on Islam) and Professor Dr. George A. Dunger, professor of Missions, North American Baptist Missionary at Sioux Theo Falls, Southern Dakota, U.S.A. Lectures will also be given by Mia Brandell-Syrier author of "Black Woman in search of God" and by the noted social anthropologist, Dr. Ellen Hellman. The conference director will be Professor G. C. Oosthuizen, professor of theology at Fort Hare. The Institute will also be attended by Professor Dr. Hans-Werner Gensichen, Associate Director of the Theological Education Fund.

We look forward to a course which, as one of a series linked to courses offered to improve the theological standard of training of ministers working amongst the non-whites, could make a tremendous contribution in the theological field in South Africa — and perhaps Africa as a whole.

INLEIDINGSARTIKEL

DIE TAAK VAN DIE PROFEET

Vir die gewone Bybelleser is die gestalte van die profeet gewoonlik die van 'n waardige bebaarde figuur uit die gryse verlede. Hy is die verpersoonliking van die boodskap van God gegee aan begenadigde enkelinge op wie God sy hand gelê het. Juis daarom het deur die eeue die gedagte posgevat dat die profetetyd naby is, dat ons moderne tyd ander tipes van leiers vereis: opvoeders, wetenskaplikes, politici, ekonome, industriëliste.

Tye van krisis bring egter aan die lig die dringende behoefte aan manne wat met goddelike gesag kan uitroep: So spreek die Here! Want in sulke tye gee menslike denke en planne geen lig, dui dit geen koers aan, bring dit geen vrede. Dan is dit net 'n woord van God wat sterkte bied — dié woord wat Hy gee deur sy profete, manne wat sy stem gehoor en as stem van God onderskeie het. Sodanige woord klink soms aanvanklik hard want dit sny in teen alle menslike begeertes en verwagtinge, dit skeur alle valse pretensies aan flarde, dit laat die mens nakend met sy woede of sy wanhoop staan voor God.

Daarom is die profeet nooit 'n populêre figuur nie, daarom word hy baie keer gekruisig of gestenig (op meer as een manier). So was dit met die profete van ouds: Jesaja, Jeremia, Amos — so is dit vandag nog. En tog is dit juis die profete wat die duisternis van denke deurbreek, wat die ingewikkeldhede van ons sondige verwarring ontrafel en die diepe heldere eenvoud van Gods waarheid openbaar aan hulle wat bereid is om te luister en te verstaan.

Dis sulke manne wat ons vandag nodig het — manne van God wat onbevrees en onverskrokke, ongeag die woord of wens van mense die woord van God bring. Te lank het te veel Christene hulle plig versuim en hulle verantwoordelikheid ontduik agter allerlei verskonings soos: „die tyd is nie ryp nie“, of „my situasie laat my nie toe nie“ of „ek sal getuig as ander eers die voortou neem“. Wie eenmaal as Christen sy lewe in God gevind het, weet dat elke Christen ook profeet is. En wie profeet is, is ook draer en verkondiger van die woord van die lewende God aan elke mens en elke gemeenskap in nood. En wie die woord wil dra moet die prys betaal. „Wie agter My aan wil kom...“

Meditation

A Sacrament... is an outward and visible sign of an inward and spiritual grace.

Eating and drinking are things we do every day. They are so much part of our daily life that we hardly stop to think about it. Similarly with washing. As we eat and drink to stay alive, so we wash to keep ourselves clean, free from dirt and disease. These are things we do almost automatically. These are things we take for granted.

Very common, ordinary things. And yet, they are the basis of our holiest, most solemn actions and occasions. For in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper we eat little bits of bread and take a small sip of wine. In the Sacrament of Baptism we take water and wash. And by these very common, ordinary actions, God comes so close to us that he becomes part of us and we become part of him. As the Scots Confession of 1560 phrases it: "... we confesse and undoubtedlie beleve, that the faithfull, in the richt use of the Lord's Tabel, do so eat the bodie and drink the blude of the Lord Jesus that he remaines in them, and they in him; Yea, they are so maid flesh of his flesh and bone of his bones."

Of course these ordinary things and actions are, in the Sacrament, ordinary no longer. We have offered them to God, and God has taken them, and given them back to us, radiant with his own glory and grace. But see what this has to say to us about the "ordinary" humdrum things of our everyday life, the day-to-day drudgery and routine, the dingy office, the frustrating encounters with people who seem determined to misunderstand you, the constant struggle to balance the household budget: all of these we can lift up to God, offer to God, and receive them back from him. But now they are different. These common things — because of what God has done with them — have become things which the risen Christ is in our midst. With these things, in them and through them, the power, love and strength of the risen Lord come to us. Now Christ is present in the day-to-day routine — and in the people who interrupt it. The dingy office is his temple, and in those frustrating meetings we meet men and women for whom Christ died.

Does this not say to us that any and every common thing can become a sacrament? Every ordinary thing can become a means of grace? All those humdrum things that seem so much part of our daily life that we take them for granted — can they not become ways through which our Lord comes to us?

And more. Does it not also mean that our Lord Christ must be taken into account in every single thing, every single decision that makes up our life? He is concerned with the way you treat your employer, the wages you pay your employee, the kind of room and the number of blankets you give to your domestic servant, the way you speak to both friend and "enemy", what you say behind closed doors about the "other" language group, the letter you write to your M.P., the way you vote. For, in our work, and in our life at home, our main purpose is surely not just to please our employer, nor simply to earn money to feed and clothe the family, nor simply to keep the peace at any price in our homes. Our purpose is to serve and honour and glorify the Saviour who comes to us in and through all these common things. Not long ago I read this poem in the church magazine of the Tsonga Presbyterian congregation at Lemana. I hope they do not mind if it is reprinted here:

R.O.

Prayer of a servant girl

*Lord of all pots and pans and things,
Since I've no time to be
A saint by doing lovely things
Or watching late with thee,
Or dreaming in the twilight,
Or storming heaven's gates,
Make me a saint by getting meals,
Or washing up the plates.
Although I must have Martha's hands,
I have a Mary mind;
And when I black the boots and shoes,
Thy sandals, Lord, I find.
Thou who didst love to give men food.
In room, or by the sea,
Accept this service that I do —
I do it unto thee.*

Books for Africa.

The Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge has launched an appeal for an additional £25,000 during the coming year for overseas Christian literature work and earmarks a large part of it for Africa and Asia.

At the Society's recent annual meeting in London it was reported that voluntary income for overseas literature work had risen to £60,000 last year and was expected to reach about £74,000 during the coming financial year.

But it was not enough, said the Society's Director, the Rev. F. N. Davey, to meet requests already received from overseas. Apart from further needs which might arise in the near future, an annual income of at least £100,000 from voluntary sources was needed. "If we could have a generous gift or several amounting to

£25,000" said Fr. Davey, "we could do now what we shall otherwise not be able to do for two or three years".

The Society was regarded as indispensable by a large part of the Anglican community and was being looked to for the rapid development of literature work in 10, ultimately 12, provinces of the Church overseas. It was actively working in 15 or 16 provinces altogether.

The Director said that the Society's imprint was on, or going to be on, some "exciting and stimulating new books", and it was intended to produce some of the best theological works already published by the Society in large paperback format at a price students could afford.

Other schemes endorsed by the meeting included a new scheme for overseas associate membership, and a drive for more full members.

Overseas associate members will be drawn from the clergy and leading members of the laity in needy dioceses to be selected by the Society's governing body, in the churches of Africa, Asia and other developing areas. On the nomination of their bishops, they will be admitted without election and will take a personal share in the Society's work, receiving its publications at privileged rates and not paying subscriptions.

The Director told the meeting that the Society had an increasing number of full subscribing members both in the home provinces and overseas, but needed many more, if it was to develop its work as the church overseas wanted to see it developed. He asked each member to recruit at least one more during the coming year.

(From "The Link", Salisbury, Sept. 1963)

Dr. B. Engelbrecht*

Die grense van nasionalisme

Die Skrifopenbaring werp 'n merkwaardige en huiweringwekkende lig op so 'n verabsoluteerde nasionalisme. Ek verwys na Markus 3 : 20—28, wat handel oor die godslastering van die skrifgeleerdes en oor die familie van Jesus. Die figure wat optree in wat hier vir ons beskrywe word, sal deur ons nie gesien mag word as rare persoonlikhede van 'n vergange geskiedenis wat in die eerste môreskerming van die Christelike godsdiens besig is om iets soos 'n amusante outydse dans uit te voer nie. Die lig van die openbaring slaan van daar uit soos 'n bliksem in die situasie wat tans blykbaar besig is om in die verhouding van die Christelike geloof en die nasionalistiese politiek in ons land te ontwikkel.

Gebeure in die Afrikaanse kerk

Volgens koerantberigte word daar van die kant van die hoogste politieke leiding sterk waarskuwings uitgesproek wat o.m. aan sekere kerkleiers gerig word, dat hulle in die hande speel van diegene wat Suid-Afrika wil verbreek. Van die Eerste Minister is die uitspraak gerapporteer: „Die sentrale bron waaruit hierdie gedagtes kom, is kommunisties van aard”. Op 'n treffende wyse is hierdie beoordeling van wat tans ook in die Afrikaanse kerke aan die gang is, uitgebeeld in 'n „spotprent” wat verskyn het in *Die Transvaler* van 5/16/63. Klaarblyklik was dit die bedoeling om daarmee in te skakel by die saak van die dag — die appèl van ds. C. F. B. Naudé teen die besluit van die Ned. Geref. Kerk se Kommissie van Eksaminatore dat hy sy status as predikant deur sy aanvaarding van die direkteurskap van die Christelike Instituut van Suidelike Afrika, verbeur. Die spotprent waarna ek verwys, het op dieselfde dag verskyn toe die Sinodale Kommissie die appèl van ds. Naudé moes oorweeg. Die toespraak van die Eerste Minister, waaruit hierbo aangehaal is, is 'n paar dae vroeër gehou. Vir almal moet dit duidelik wees wat die strekking van hierdie waarskuwing is.

Wat op die oomblik in die Afrikaanse kerke, n.t.n. in die Ned. Geref. Kerk, besig is om te gebeur, en wat deur baie met blydschap begroet word omdat hulle die werking van die Gees van God daarin bespeur — die stigting van die Christelike Instituut is soos 'n eerste vrug (al is dit 'n taamlike laat vrug) daarvan — en verder, wat deur baie in die lig van Gods Woord nie anders beoordeel kan word as die werking van die Gees van God nie (en hier moet met klem daarop gewys word dat die Woord van God die ewige waarheid bevat wat geopenbaar is; uit sy Woord kan ons sy geopenbaarde wil ken); en eindelijk, wat deur baie soos in die klare daglig gesien word, n.l. dat „God besig (is) met die kerk in Suid-Afrika soos nog nooit tevore nie” (C. F. B. Naudé in sy afskeidspreek, vgl. „Die Transvaler”, 4/10/63, bl. 9), word van die kant van die hoogste politieke leiding in ons land gesien as 'n dwaas ondergraving van die kerk om die dinamiet van liberalisme en kommunisme onder sy fondament in te laai (vgl. die spotprent) — 'n „sabotage”-daad wat

Wanneer die nasionalisme homself verabsoluteer, is dit besig om alle grense waarbinne dit nog voor God kan bestaan, te oorskry.

nie alleen die kerk sal vernietig nie, maar in sy eintlike intensie daarop gerig is om in die naam van die godsdiens en die vroomheid, die politieke eenheid van die land in die lug te blaas.

Die aangesproke kerkleiers is mense wat sonder enige twyfel hulle insigte uit die besondere openbaring van God ontvang het. Al is dit nou met die politiek van die dag nog so onversoenbaar en vir die voorstanders daarvan nog so onaantreklik, dit is nie 'n grondgedagte van die kommunisme of die liberalisme nie, maar van die ewige en geopenbaarde waarheid van God, van die evangelie van Jesus Christus, dat almal, sonder onderskeid, wat die wil van God doen, saamverbonde is in 'n nuwe volk, 'n heilige familie — 'n eenheid dus waarin die woord „apartheid” selfs in sy mees getemperde betekenis 'n onweluidende klank het — op 'n grondslag wat die betekenis van alle verbande van bloedverwantskap en volksverwantskap transcendeer. In hierdie heilige eenheid is God die vader en die mense is broeders en susters van mekaar. Bloed- en volksverwantskap tree daarin geheel en al op die agtergrond.

Natuurlike bande nie vernietig maar geheilig

Hierby moet egter opgemerk word dat die kerkleiers wat deur die Godsopenbaring tot hierdie insig gekom het, die bedoeling van die Heer ook so verstaan dat Hy hulle daarmee nie wil dwing om in 'n stoïsynse gevoelsoosheid vir alle bloed- en volksverwantskap die eensaamheid aan te durf nie. Die dieper, sterker, ewige verband wat tussen mense werklik geword het, transcendeer die bloed- en volksverwantskap nie op so 'n wyse dat dit vernietig word nie, maar wel só dat dit daardeur ingesluit, omvat en geheilig word.

Die verbond van God blyk ook die bloedverwantskap in sy natuurlikheid te heilig; maar tog lê die natuurlike bloedverwantskap (en in sy wyere vorme: volksverwantskap en rasseverwantskap) nie aan die verbond van God ten grondslag nie. In die samevoering van sy nuwe volk en in die verwekking deur die Gees van sy heilige familie, is dit nie 'n faktor van bepalende betekenis nie. Intendeel, dit kan selfs 'n ontbinding van hierdie natuurlike bande meebring. Dit kan skeiding bring tussen broer en broer, tussen vader en kind, tussen ouers en kinders (vgl. Matth. 10 : 21).

Verabsoluttering van die volkseie

Waar die nasionalisme in 'n nasionale politiek verabsoluteer word, is dit voor die hand liggend dat die sogenaamde insigte wat uit die openbaring op ons toekoms, nie alleen met gereserveerdheid nie, maar ook met openlike afkeuring en vyandskap bejeen sal word. 'n Nasionale politiek wat aan die verabsoluttering van die nasionalisme ten prooi geval het, ken

en erken slegs een beginsel van keuring, n.l. die eksklusiewe volkseie. Die enigste maatstawwe wat hier geld, is dié wat met die volksgeskiedenis, die verlede en die toekoms van die volk rekening hou. 'n Kerkleier wat in hierdie opsig uit die pas raak en wie se spreke uit die toon begin val, moet daarom die sterkste teenstand verwag. Immers, as dit met die Heer van die openbaring die geval was, dan kan sy dienaars, die draers van sy openbaring in hierdie wêreld, dit nie anders verwag nie; en so is dit ook aan hulle geopenbaar: „'n Leerling is nie bo die meester nie en 'n dienskneg ook nie bo sy heer nie... As hulle die heer van die huis Beëlsebul genoem het, hoeveel te meer sy huisgenote!” (Matth. 10 : 24—25).

Reaksie teen Jesus: Markus 3

Die reaksie teen Jesus word in Markus 3 geteken in die tweërlei verhouding waarin diegene wat nie tot sy „familie” behoort het nie, tot Hom gestaan het. „Sy mense”, in bloedverwantskap aan Hom verbonde, maar nog geen lede van sy familie nie, het gesê dat Hy sy sinne kwyt geraak het. Met 'n liefdevolle besorgdheid oor Hom, wou hulle probeer verhoed dat Hy in die „ekstase” waarin hulle gemeen het dat Hy geraak het, vir hulle verlore sou gaan. Hy het Homself so reserweloos vir die menigte gegee, dat sy mense angstig begin word het en dat Hy daardeur verteer sou word. Hulle oogmerk was om Hom te red van die skare. In die tweede geval, dié van die nasionalistiese leiers, was daar ook 'n angstige besorgdheid, dog nie oor Jesus nie, maar oor die volk. Die nasionalistiese maatstawwe wat by hulle gegeld het, het hulle voor hul oë sien verkrummel in 'n versameling van mense rondom 'n ander middelpunt — die „supranasionalistiese” heil wat sondaars, sonder uitsondering, by Hom gevind het. Markus se uitdruklike mededeling dat die Skrifgeleerdes „van Jerusalem afgekome het”, is betekenisvol. Jerusalem is hier te verstaan as die sentrum van die politieke oorlegginge; daar het die keuring van mense plaasgevind met maatstawwe wat met Israel se geskiedenis, sy verlede en sy toekoms, rekening gehou het. Aan hierdie maatstaf moes die reg en die gesag waarmee Jesus opgetree het, gemeet word.

As ons nou in ag neem dat hierdie verabsoluteerde nasionalisme optree met die pretensie dat dit 'n goddelike openbaringsgehalte het en daarom 'n normatiewe geldigheid moet hê, dan is dit verklaarbaar dat dit 'n geslotenheid van sisteem sal vertoon wat geen erupsies sal duld nie. Die leiding wat daarvan uitgaan, maak daarop aanspraak dat dit die enige, die ware, die van God gewilde is. Alles wat daaraan vreemd is, moet noodwendig ook vreemd wees aan God; alles wat hy as vyandig teen hem beskou, moet ook aan God vyandig wees.

En as ons voorts in ag neem dat die verabsoluteerde nasionalisme in die supranasionalistiese evangelie van

Jesus sy grootste bedreiging moet sien, dan is dit ewe verklaarbaar dat hy daarteen in 'n radikale verset sal kom. Sy eie religieuse gehalte speel 'n rol daarin om hom die mag van Jesus te laat herken as 'n buitengewone een, wat nie met gewone menslike middele bestry kan word nie. Laat begaan kan hy egter nie, want dit sou onverantwoordelikheid en pligsverzuim teenoor homself wees waardeur sy eie opheffing verhaas word. Hy ag dit sy roeping en sy plig om te waarsku — en so lank hy van homself in sy verhouding tot die menigte (d.w.s. teenoor Jesus) onseker is, bly dit by 'n waarskuwing en word geweldmaatreëls voorlopig nog agterweë gehou. Maar dan moet sy — voorlopig geweldlose — waarskuwing 'n genoegsame uitdrukking van sy radikale verset wees. Die gewig wat in die skaal gelê word, moet groot genoeg wees dat dit nie alleen kan opweeg teen die aanspraak van Jesus nie, maar dit ook kan kanselleer en kan ophef. Dit moet 'n radikale „nee” wees vir Jesus — geen gewone „nee” nie, maar tot die uiterste radikaliteit gebring deur dit te kwalifiseer. Dáárom is sy leer en sy optrede so verwerplik, nie slegs omdat Hy, onopsetlik miskien, die nasionale besef en strewe belemmer nie, maar juis omdat Hy dit met opset — wat die verabsoluteerde nasionalisme alleen as 'n base opset wil beoordeel — benadeel. Die bron waaruit sy leer en optrede voortkom, is duiwels van aard! Hy is Beëlsebul! Deur die owerste van die duiwels dryf Hy die duiwels uit.

Innerlike teenstrydigheid van hierdie standpunt

Die innerlike teenstrydigheid in hierdie oordeelvelling, is opvallend. Maar die nasionalistiese hartstog is blind daarvoor. Jesus dryf tog duiwels uit; dat Hy inderdaad vreugde en bevryding bring, kan nie ontken word nie. Maar dat daar tegelyk gemeenskap ontstaan wat die nasionale grense deurbreek — want as Hy 'n moeder en broers kan hê oor die grense van bloedverwantskap heen, en om „sy mense” so 'n geheel nuwe grens trek in die bepaling: „Elkeen wat die wil van God doen...”, dan is daar geen aardse beperkinge meer nie — daarvoor is daar net een verklaring. Net die duiwel kan geen „nasionalis” wees nie. Laat hierdie oordeel maar gerus na alle kante teenstrydig wees — van belang is alleen dat die vergoddelikte nasionalisme onaangetas sal bly. Die aanbidders van die nasionalisme is in elk geval blind daarvoor. Hulle is te selfgenoegsaam om dit op te merk; hulle duld niks anders nie, as net dit wat die nasionalisme tot verheerliking kan bring; hulle glo daaraan en daaraan alléén, en is verder vir alles geslote; hulle stoot alles af wat nie in hierdie geslote sisteem pas nie en hulle vrees en vloek alles wat maar enigins na 'n bedreiging lyk. Jesus kan hulle wel nog wys op die teenpraak waarin hulle met hulleself beland het, maar is dit miskien te laat om hulle só daarvan bewys te maak dat hulle dit ook sal besef? In elk geval, laat hulle dit dan maar hoor: Kan die satan vir die gebondenes van die satan vreugde en bevryding bring? Sou die satan sy eie mag oor mense

afbreek? Want anders as só, nl. dat die satan daarmee in sy terrorisme gestuit word, kan dit tog nie beoordeel word nie as sy gevangenes 'n ontferming ondervind wat met so 'n krag en so 'n liefde aan hulle betoon word dat dit die krag en die liefde van die sterkste bloedverwantskap te bowe gaan? Waarlik, so sal die satan nie teen homself verdeeld wees en teen homself opstaan nie.

Die nasionalisme staan hier voor sy uiterste grens. Hier val die beslissing of dit nog voor God kan bestaan of nie kan bestaan nie. Jesus kon die goddelose aantygings teen Hom weerlê met 'n eenvoudige gelykenis. Hy, die „sterker” van wie Johannes die Doper getuig het, het in die huis van die „sterk man” ingegaan, hom geboei en is besig om sy goed van hom te roef, om sy gebonden te bevry tot die nuwe volk, die geestelike familie van Jesus, waar die dieper, sterker, ewige verband, wat die verbintenis in 'n natuurlike bloedverwantskap en volksverwantskap transendeer, hulle in 'n nuwe liefde, eenheid en gemeenskap met mekaar verbind. „Wie die wil van God doen”, is die grondslag van hierdie nuwe gemeenskap.

Maar in die eenvoudige weerlegging, op sigself skynbaar niks meer nie as 'n openbaring van die weerloosheid teenoor die krag en die geweld an so 'n vernietigende beskuldiging. lê daar 'n verdoemende oordeel, wat deur God slegs in 'n geval van die uiterste grensoorskryding uitgespreek word. „Voorwaar Ek sê vir julle, al die sondes sal die mensekinders vergewe word en al die lasteringe wat hulle mag uitgespreek het; maar wie teen die Heilige Gees gelaster het, het geen vergifnis tot in ewigheid nie, maar is skuldig aan die ewige oordeel” — omdat hulle gesê het: Hy het 'n onreine gees” (Markus 3 : 28—30).

„Werktuie van Liberalisme en Kommunisme”

Daar behoort by niemand nou meer enige onsekerheid te wees oor hoe ernstig die saak is as daar na sekere „kerkleiers wat, met insigte van die besondere openbaring van God, in die geleedere van die kerk en die politiek so 'n beroering veroorsaak het, suggestief of uitgesproke verwys word as werktuie van die liberalisme en die kommunisme nie.

Aan meer as om slegs daarop te wys dat die lig wat vanuit die openbaring daarop val, 'n ontsettende verklaring daaraan gee en 'n verdoemende oordeel daarvoor uitspreek, wil ons ons liever nie waag nie. Dat ons hier reeds staan by die uiterste grensoorskryding van 'n nasionalisme wat homself wil verabsoluteer, kan in die lig van die Skrif as 'n stelling geponeer word. Maar ten opsigte van ons eie situasie is dit gerade om ons konklusies te temper deur voorlopig nog vraenderwys te spreek: Is hierdie grens reeds so onherroeplik oorskry dat hulle wat hulle „nee” teenoor die waarheid uit die evangelie van Jesus met 'n kwalifikasie radikaliseer („liberalisme”; „kommunisme”), in dié stadium van verharding verkeer waarin hulle hul „nee” ook bedoel tot in die bitterste konsekwensie? Die huiweringwekkende gedagte aan wat 'n uiterste grens voor God beteken en hoe Hy oor die oorskryding van daardie grens oordeel, mag dit verhoed dat ons hier reeds van die sonde teen die Heilige Gees sal praat. Tog kan dit vir die kerk nie anders as duidelik wees dat daar gevaarlik na aan die rand van die afgrond beweeg word nie — aan die uiterste grense. As Jesus, en Hy

(vervolg in volgende kolom)

Rev. S. P. Freeland*

POLITICS HAS NO ANSWER IN THE PRESENT CRISIS

A few months ago newspaper placards in Johannesburg greeted the citizens on their way to work with the words, “Crisis of Survival Looms”. There was a rush for the morning edition by men and women who found themselves asking what further developments had taken place in an already deteriorating situation in their country.

On the front page of the newspaper they read in heavy type that the Prime Minister had stated in a debate in the House of Assembly that the current situation in South Africa could lead to a “crisis of survival”, and that the situation might well have serious consequences for the country.

Later that day details were released of the Minister of Justice's new General Law Amendment Bill, containing powers more sweeping than any previously conferred on a South African Government in peace time.

Dr. Verwoerd was, of course, speaking with great moderation when he said that recent events “could lead” to crisis. The truth is that crisis is here. It is not on the way; it has arrived. We are living in a time of grave crisis for our land and its peoples. The whole future of our country, and the welfare of generations to come, hinges on how we, the people of South Africa, react in the present situation. Note that. Not merely how the government reacts, important as their responsibility is, but how we, South Africa's citizens, react.

What is the essence of the present crisis? Complicated as many of the issues connected with it may be, in essence it is fairly clear and simple. It is the old story of the immovable object and the irresistible force. In this case the immovable object appears to be the type of Afrikaner nationalism which at present holds the reins of government in the country, and the irresistible force is that of African nationalism. There is much in between these two, and the movements and groups which support neither of them are not to be lightly dismissed. But stripped down to its

alleen, die Hoof en Heer van die kerk is; as dit sy Woord is wat vir die kerk geld; as die waarskuwings wat aan die kerk gerig word, in die eerste instansie van Hom gehoor moet word, en dan ook van Hom alleen; as die kerk sy Heer, en daarmee sy eie wese, nie wil verloën nie, dan moet die situasie waarin hy hom tans bevind vir hom geen twyfel laat nie.

Vir die kerk in Suid-Afrika, m.n. vir die Hollands-Afrikaanse Kerke, en in besonder vir die Ned. Geref. Kerk, wat die grootste getal Afrikaners van nasionale gevoele onder sy lede tel, het die uur gekom dat hy hom (betyds nog?) moet losruk uit die bande waarmee die verabsoluttering van die nasionalisme besig is om hom te bind, soos Simson hom losgeruk het uit die bande van die Filistyne. Voordat dit te laat is; voordat sy „nasireërskap” as draer van die krag en die waarheid van God in hierdie wêreld, in sy slaap van hom geroof word. Want ook vanuit kerklike kring word daar reeds stemme gehoor wat getuïenisse wat nêrens anders nie as uit die besondere openbaring, uit die evangelie van Jesus Christus vandaan kom, veroordeel as getuïenisse vanuit 'n liberalistiese en kommunistiese bron.

* Dr. B. Engelbrecht is predikant van die Ned. Geref. Kerk, Johannesburg-Oos.

naked reality, the struggle is clearly between two similar brands of nationalism, and every day it grows more and more into a life and death struggle between white dominance and black dominance.

Politics has no answer

In the face of this struggle, politics, although taken more seriously in the Republic than in most other countries in the world, has no answer. There are political theories, policies and programmes which read well on paper, but they are no answer in the present crisis because their protagonists are quite unable to persuade sufficient people to accept them to get on with the job of implementation. And all the while, whilst doctrinaire politicians argue and preach and write to the press, the two chief combatants in the struggle feverishly arm themselves for the great showdown.

A well-known South African wrote recently of the bankruptcy of political thought adequate to meet the modern situation. “We have theories”, he said, “which superficially at any rate meet the needs of reasonably settled and stable communities, but where is our philosophy of crisis?”

What message indeed have we that will find a response among black and white, liberal and conservative, the haves and the have-nots, and which will call forth from them a loyalty which will override that of racial group or political party for the sake of their common fatherland?

That is where South Africa stands today. Torn by inner dissension and threat of violence, it seems like to be crushed between the two giants of intransigent and granite-like white nationalism and growingly overwhelming black nationalism. And all the while politics offers fine speeches and airy promises but does nothing to call a halt to the opposing forces that threaten to destroy by their senseless and selfish actions everything that we hold dear as lovers of our country.

The only answer

Is there an answer? There is. It is an old answer, as old as the prophets of Israel, as old as Solomon himself, for it was to him that the answer was given.

If my people, which are called by my name, shall humble themselves, and pray, and seek my face, and turn from their wicked ways; then will I hear from heaven, and will forgive their sin, and will heal their land.

In other words, the only hope for South Africa in this present crisis lies in a return to God. This is not dogmatism but realism, the only true realism in the kind of situation in which we find ourselves. For it takes into account all the facts — not me-

rely those which it wishes to recognise.

Those at present split up into separate camps and groups are blind to what they do not wish to see. They are very much aware of their own needs, their own fears, their own grievances. They are also deeply aware of the faults of those who differ fundamentally from them. But few of them are prepared even to try to be a little objective and to see a) their own faults, and b) their enemies' natural fears and anxieties. It is only when we look away from ourselves and turn to God that we are able to see the situation in true perspective. Selfishness and the refusal to seek God first make us blind.

The Church, Christianity — or God?

I do not say that the answer is to be found in a return to religion, lest that be misunderstood. There are types of religion, and even types of Christianity, which provide no answer. Neither do I say that we must return to the Church, for that is not sufficient. The Church itself must bear some responsibility for the present situation. It has not always called men back to the ways of God, and it certainly has not always shown forth in its own fellowship the Christian answer.

But return to God we must, or all is lost. When there is no other adequate answer to the crisis, here is the only answer. Nationalism which has become an end in itself is certainly not an answer. Self-preservation is not an answer, for he that would save his life ends up by losing it. Survival alone, whether individual, group or national, can never be a fully Christian motive. The words of the Man of Nazareth come echoing down the years and are as relevant to our needs as to those of the people of first century Palestine, “Seek ye first the Kingdom of God, and his righteousness, and all these things shall be added unto you”.

History bears repeated witness to this truth. Always it has been those who have recognised the hand of God and followed its guidance who have been the true realists. It was they who preserved the Roman contribution to western Europe. It was they who, moved and caught up by the message or the evangelical revival, saved eighteenth century England from bloody revolution. Our help too lies in the message of those who say, Return to God and His ways — the rest will fall into place.

Have we a man, or group of men, who can lead us back, who are ready to embark upon a Mission to the Nation? Such a Mission, led by Bishop Benavente in 1900, saved Chile and Argentina from war at the beginning of this century. Such a Mission might well save our beloved country from the holocaust which everybody fears but which all the political parties seem powerless to avert. For with God, and those who turn back to God, is the answer. Sooner or later this truth will be forced upon all thinking people.

Why not accept it now?

* Rev. S. P. Freeland is Minister of the Methodist Church in Pretoria.

Ds. J. Oglethorpe*

Vooruitsigte vir die kerk in Noord-Rhodesië.

Sendingwerk onder die Lozi van Batrotseland is in 1885 deur Francois Coillard van die Paryse Sendinggenootskap begin. Hy is gevolg deur die „Primitive Methodists” wat in 1890 werk onder die Batoka in die suidelike dele van Noord-Rhodesië begin het. Rondom die begin van die twintigste eeu is sendingwerk onderneem deur die N.G. Kerk (O.V.S.) in die oostelike deel van die land; deur die Skotse Kerk en die London Missionary Society in die noorde; deur die Brethren in Christ in die noord-weste, en deur die Universities Mission to Central Africa (Anglikaans). Die streek waar koper later ontdek is, was yl-bevolk, en alleen die Baptiste het 'n klein sendingstasie in die gebied gehad, toe die opening van die kopermyne in 1926 skielik duisende mense daarheen getrek het.

Die houding van al die sendelinge, toe hulle lidmate na die Koperstreek begin stroom het, was dat dit nie die moeite werd was om hulle daarheen te volg nie, aangesien hulle tog binnekort na hulle tuistes sou terugkeer. Gevolglik was daar vir ongeveer sewe jaar geen vaste, amptelike kerklike arbeid onder die inwoners van die Koperstreekdorpe nie.

Die Christene is op hulleself aangewys vir gemeentelike lewe. Die merkwaardige is dat hulle nie op hulle laat wag het nie. Altans nie die swart Christene nie. Spontaan het lidmate van verskillende kerke saam vergader vir aanbidding en onderlinge stigting. Die „gemeentes” het selfs hulle eie geboutjies opgerig en hulle eie evangeliste besoldig. Op eie inisiatief het hulle sendingwerk onder die omliggende omgekerstende dorpie onderneem. Ouderlinge, deur die gemeentes self aangestel, het vir die orde in die kerk gesorg.

A. J. Cross, sendeling van die S.A. Baptist Mission, skryf in 1929 soos volg: „A self-supporting, self-governing native Church has grown up and it is daily gaining in strength and experience... Natives of widely varying tribes, speaking different languages, whose ancestors were once hereditary enemies, are making the grand experiment of working and worshipping in closest unity and co-operation. Not only are these natives drawn from varying tribes but their spiritual history is associated with Missions of various denominational connections; but they give objective proof of their oneness in Christ Jesus.”

Was dit nie waarlik kerk?

Die gevaar van 'n romantiese hoogskatting van hierdie eertydse „Union Church” is natuurlik groot. 'n Mens moet jouself afvra of dit wel 'n kerk genoem kan word. Daar was nog geen belydenisgrondslag om die prediking in die kerk te normeer nie. Dit het aan geordendes in die kerk heeltemal ontbreek, en die kerk was afhanklik vir die sakramentsbediening van die ongereelde besoeke van 'n sendeling. Volgens ons aanvaarde maatstawwe was die „Union Church” nog geen ware kerk nie. Tog glo ek dat 'n meer beskeie oordeel nie onvanpas sal wees nie. Durf ons die werking van die Heilige Gees deur ons histories-bepaalde *notae ecclesiae* aan bande lê? Kan die kerk nooit iets anders wees

Die eerste kerk op die Koperstreek was „swart”. Dit was in die jare 1926 tot 1933. Uit alle dele van Noord-Rhodesië, Njassaland en Tanganjika het mense na die kopermyne gestroom op soek na werk. Baie van hulle was Christene.

as wat ons daaronder verstaan nie? Is dit nie moontlik dat die kerk ook soms daár kan wees waar niks meer gebeur as dat twee of drie in die Naam van Jesus Christus vergader nie? Ek is daar oortuig van dat, hoeser hierdie armsalige „Union Church” ook aan die erkende maatstawwe van die ware kerk kortgeskiet het, dit nogtans deur die genadige werking van die Heilige Gees 'n ware kerk was. Dit was in die diepste sin van die woord 'n onafhanklike kerk. Dit het nie vir sy ontstaan van sending-inisiatief afgehang nie. Dit het ook nie vir sy voortbestaan van geordendes, deur die sending gevorm en voorsien, afgehang nie. En die struktuur en organisasie van die kerk was tot so 'n sikrale minimum beperk dat dit sonder die geld van die sending kon klaarkom.

Koperstreek word „sendingveld”

In 1933 het die sending op die Koperstreek toegesak. Die mense van die koperstreekdorpe het 'n „sendingveld” geword. Die wyse waarop die sendingaksie geloods is, was so korrek soos kan kom. 'n Kommissie van Ondersoek, gestuur deur die Internasionale Sendingraad, het eers 'n deeglike opname gemaak. 'n Gesaghebbende verslag oor alle aspekte van die lewe in Noord-Rhodesië is gepubliseer. Een van die aanbevelings was dat die afsonderlike sendinge nie elk sy eie werk op die Koperstreek moet kom stig nie, maar dat dit 'n gesamentlike sendingpoging moet wees. Gevolglik is die „United Missions in the Copperbelt” gestig. Die taak van hierdie verenigde sending sou wees om die Union Church uit te bou en te versterk, en om 'n program van sosiale aksie te loods.

Dit was 'n allesins loflike onderneeming. Vir meer as vyftien jaar het 'n span toegewyde sendelinge 'n gesëende werk op die Koperstreek gedoen. Wat die stigters van hierdie sending eger nie ingesien het nie, was dat, met die oornam van die kerk deur die sending, een van die wesenskenmerke van die kerk, nl. sy onafhanklikheid, ingeboet is. Die kerk het afhanklik geword, afhanklik van die leiding, inisiatief en geldelike steun van die sending. 'n Mens kan nie ontken dat die lede van die Union Church die koms van die sendelinge verwelkom het nie. Immers daar is baie voordele aan so 'n paternalistiese verhouding verbonde, en onafhanklikheid bring die swaar las van verantwoordelike me. Tog voel 'n mens jammer dat 'n jong kerk, so vol belofte, so gou voor die versoeking moes swig om sy eersgeboortereg vir die lensiesop van voogdyskap in te ruil.

Die nadelige gevolge het dan ook nie lank uitgebly nie. Die afhanklikheid is spoedig deur verdeeldheid gevolg. Die inheemse kerk van die Koperstreek, wat aanvanklik een was, het die patroon van die sendende kerk gevolg. Die Anglikaanse Kerk het sy lidmate van die Union Church onttrek.

Ander kerke het die voorbeeld gevolg. Uiteindelik het net die Presbiteriane en Kongregasionaliste oorgebly. (Heelwat later het ook die Suid-Afrikaanse vleuel van die Presbiteriaanse Kerk weggebreek.) Die agteruitgang het 'n laagtepunt bereik, toe die blanke mynwerkers ook kerkbewus begin word het, en al hoe meer die sendelinge vir hulleself opgeëis het. Onvermydelik het die kerklike verdeeldheid dus ook die kleurskeidslyn gevolg, en 'n bevoorregte blanke kerk is toegelaat om naas die van-die-sending-afhanklike inheemse kerk te ontstaan.

Dit is van belang, meen ek, om by 'n beoordeling van die vooruitsigte vir die kerk in Noord-Rhodesië hierdie oënskynlik onbelangrike ontwikkeling van 'n onafhanklike na 'n afhanklike kerk op die Koperstreek in gedagte te hou. Die kerk was eers afhanklik. Die onafhanklikheid was nie die resultaat van 'n lang periode van voogdyskap aan die einde waarvan die sending besluit het dat die tyd ryp was vir onafhanklikheid nie. Die onafhanklikheid was spontaan en ongeorganiseerd. Ook die eenheid. Daar was geen interkerklike onderhandelinge wat tot 'n formele besluit om een te word gelei het nie. Nog belangriker: die onafhanklikheid en eenheid was nie 'n toegewing aan politieke of ekonomiese omstandighede nie. Dit het gebeur lank voor daar van nasionale selfbewuswording onder die inboorlinge van Noord-Rhodesië sprake was.

Radikale veranderinge

Intussen het alles radikaal anders geword. Na dertig jaar is die kerk oor die algemeen meer afhanklik as ooit. In een kerk, die United Church of Central Africa, is daar sestig voltydse sendelinge en sendingwerkers(sters) teenoor twintig natuurlike-leraars en elf evangeliste. Die verhouding is waarskynlik nie veel anders in die ander kerke nie. Daar is wel die skyn van selfstandigheid, maar die eintlike beheer word nog deur die sendelinge uitgeoefen. Meeste van die sendelinge is daarvan oortuig dat die tyd lank nog nie ryp is vir volle onafhanklikheid nie. Een van die redes hiervoor is dat die struktuur van die kerk so duur, en die organisasie so ingewikkeld geword het, wat dit 'n hele leër van deskundiges verg net om dit aan die gang te hou. In die lig hiervan word die eis om selfstandigheid heeltemal pragmaties beoordeel. Die vraag is steeds of die kerk selfonderhoudend en selfregerend kan wees. Die moontlikheid van 'n alternatiewe vorm van die kerk wat minder duur en gekompliseerd sal wees, word nooit oorweeg nie. Gevolglik kom die vraag na die geestelike onafhanklikheid van die kerk nooit ter sprake nie.

Maar die gang van sake sal nie wag totdat die sendelinge eendag besluit dat die tyd nou ryp geword het vir die onafhanklikheid van die inheemse kerk nie. Noord-Rhodesië word binnekort onafhanklik onder 'n swart regering. Die kerk in hierdie land sal nie

ongedeerd daarvan afkom nie. Die jammerte is dat vergaderinge wat teologies gemotiveer moes gewees het, nou onder druk van politieke omstandighede sal plaasvind. M.a.w. die kerk het tot 'n groot mate reeds sy vryheid verloor om te besluit waarom, wanneer en hoe die nodige veranderinge aangebring sal word. 'n Paar voorbeelde sal hierdie stelling ophelder.

Deur die jare het die kerk 'n massiewe „sosiale aksie” opgebou. Veral aan onderwys en mediese werk is veel gedoen. Die belangrikheid van hierdie bydrae tot die ontwikkeling van die land word allerweë met waardering erken. Maar daar is ook 'n gevoel van wrewel, want die skole is deur die koloniale bestuur gesubsidieer, en die hospitale deur die Federale Regering. Onvermydelik word die werk dus met die gehate ou regime vereenselwig. Daar bestaan by my geen twyfel dat eers die skole, en dan die hospitale, genasionaliseer gaan word nie. In beginsel kan niemand teen so 'n stap beswaar maak nie. Die vraag is egter waarom die kerke met die oorhandiging van hulle skole en hospitale wag totdat dit met wetgewing afgedwing word. Sou dit wees dat die kerke hierdie inrigtings as onmisbare en onvervangbare evangelisasie-middels beskou?

Het die kerke so afhanklik geword van inrigtings vir die uitvoering van hulle sendingtaak dat hulle aan geen ander middele meer kan dink nie? Wat word gedoen om Christen-onderwysers, -geneeshere en -verpleegsters te vorm om in die komende sekulêre skole en hospitale hulle getuieis effektief te lewer?

Dit blyk reeds dat onderwysers wat onder 'n verpligting was om op Sondae die kerk as kategete te dien, nou weier om hierdie opgelegde taak te verrig, omdat hulle salarisse deur die Staat betaal word. Kan 'n mens hulle kwalik neem?

Posisie van die sendeling

Die vraag na die toekomstige posisie van die sendeling is ewe akueel. Allerweë word gesê dat die sendelinge se dae getel is. Dit is egter 'n politieke slotsom en nie 'n teologiese nie. Die debat oor die vraag of die sendelinge moet bly of nie word op 'n bloot pragmatiese vlak gevoer. „Wat sal van die organisasie van die kerk word as hulle weg gaan?” Sommige sendelinge gaan uit hulle pad om hulle onmisbaar te maak. Ander neem die houding in dat alles wat 'n natuurlike-leraar sê sonder teësprak aanvaar moet word. Dit is onvoordelig om in die openbaar die indruk te skep dat 'n swart man kan fouteer. Veral Engelssprekende sendelinge maak hulle aan hierdie toegee-houding skuldig.

Eenheid van die kerk

Ten slotte wil ek verwys na die vraag na die eenheid van die kerk in Noord-Rhodesië. Die oorspronklike drang tot eenheid wat tot die Union Church gelei het, is nog sterk. Die nasionale ontwaking het nuwe lewe daarin geblaas. Daar is 'n sterk gevoel, sowel binne as buite die kerk, dat die verdeeldheid van die kerk deel is van

(vervolg op bladsy 7)

? WHAT IS A CHRISTIAN ?

Rev. Brian Gilmour*

What is a Christian? This is a seemingly simple question. But how difficult it is to really answer it!

Christianity outside the church

Long ago St. Augustine clearly saw the boundless dimensions of Christianity. He wrote, "That which is called the Christian religion existed among the Ancients, and never did not exist, from the beginning of the human race until Christ came in the flesh, at which time the true religion, which already existed, began to be called Christianity." This deep perspective has been shared in our century by that great missionary C. F. Andrews. Concerning his approach to the Indian people he told a friend of Dr Fosdick "I always assume that they are Christian; and after I have talked with them for a while I sometimes see the light of Christ in their eyes."

In an article in a recent issue of Pro Veritate reference was made to Mahatma Gandhi. The shortcomings of the Christian Church were cited as reason for Gandhi being 'lost to the Christ and His Church'. Can we really speak of him as being lost to the

(vervolg van bladsy 6)

die vreemde Westerse patroon wat met onafhanklikheid sal moet verdwyn.

Dr. Kenneth Kaunda het in een van sy uitsprake te kenne gegee dat die veelheid van kerke in Noord-Rhodesië vir hom en sy mense 'n groot struikelblok op die weg na 'n volledige aanvaarding van die Christelike geloof is. Weereens word van politieke sy druk op die kerk uitgeoefen om te doen wat dit om teologiese redes behoort te doen. 'n Verandering in die politieke situasie maak onverwags van 'n teologiese onmoontlikheid 'n praktiese noodsaaklikheid. Maar is dit goed vir die kerk om deur politieke omstandighede gesterk te word?

Die United Church of Central Africa het onlangs besluit om in die lig van die veranderde omstandighede in Noord-Rhodesië hom vir 'n „nasionale kerk" te beywer. Die aanhef van die besluit lui soos volg: „Synod expressed its strong conviction that there are urgent political(!) as well as theological reasons for the establishment of a truly national Church in Northern Rhodesia". Neem die kerk besluite om politieke redes?

Ten nouste hiermee saam hang die vraag na die posisie van blankes in die toekomstige kerk in Noord-Rhodesië. Na my mening sal 'n kerk wat wil voortgaan om van die „slegs-vir-blankes"-uithangbordjie gebruik te maak, wel geduld word, maar dit sal in 'n ghetto-kerk ontlaar, 'n kerk wat so geïsoleerd sal wees van die werklikheid waarin dit bestaan, dat dit nie meer as die sout van die aarde sal kan fungeer nie.

Christianity is bigger than any or all of its manifestations in Christendom. The acknowledgement of this fact tempers our dogmatism, exposes the limitations of our shibboleths, and frees the spirit from bondage to the letter. So often our Christianity is tightly bound up with ecclesiastical affiliation, with adherence to a set of beliefs, or with a pietistic experience. These are channels or moulds of Christianity but no more than that. The living reality cannot be confined to any one means grace or any set number of them.

Christ? Does not the case of Gandhi witness to the fact that Christianity is bigger than Christendom? C. F. Andrews was a very close friend of Gandhi, and his reflections deserve careful consideration. In his book *What I Owe to Christ* he writes "Not I alone, but numbers of sincere and earnest Christians in South Africa, when they watched the self-sacrificing conduct of Mr and Mrs Gandhi, would say with conviction, 'These good people are better Christians than we are'. Such words were not a mere formal mode of speech, but rather a direct acknowledgment of a divine truth. For these Indian passive resisters were (italics, C.F.A.) better Christians, through they remained Hindus and Musalmans, just as they were born. Facts like these had to be taken into account in reading the New Testament and in framing any theory of the Christian faith." Elsewhere in the same book Andrews speaks of Gandhi as "so entirely 'Hindu, and yet so supremely Christian'..." It seemed to point to an organic unity, beneath the outward differences of religion, which needed to be traced, if mankind was ever to become one in spirit." In the providence of the Eternal Spirit Gandhi filled the role of a disturber of rigid conceptions of Christianity.

Naught for your comfort

To open oneself to the parable of the sheep and the goats (Matth. 25) — the ultimate judgment — is to invite discomfort, especially if one does not resort to interpretations which remove its sting.

"For when I was hungry, you gave me food; when thirsty you gave me drink; when I was a stranger you took me into your home, when naked you clothed me; when I was ill you came to my help, when in prison you visited me..."

Lord when was it that we saw you hungry and fed you...

I tell you this: anything you did for one of my brothers here, however humble, you did for me...

For when I was hungry you gave me nothing to eat...

Lord when was it that we saw you hungry... and did nothing for you...

I tell you this: anything you did not do for one of these, however humble, you did not do for me."

We have a natural tendency to think of religion as a department of life. The parable of the sheep and the goats locates it in the common ways. "The holy is the depth of the common" writes the Bishop of Woolwich in his book *Honest to God*. Some years ago Middleton Murry put it in an even more radical way "To be human is to be Christian."

Henry Drummond in his classic

The Greatest Thing in the World says "In the Book of Matthew, where the Judgment Day is depicted for us in the imagery of One seated upon a throne, and dividing the sheep from the goats, the test of a man is then not, 'How have I believed?' but 'How have I loved?' The test of religion, the final test of religion, is not religiousness, but love."

Can anyone, having read the parable of the sheep and the goats, stick out his chest and say 'I am a Christian?' Is our reaction not rather to cry 'Lord have mercy, Lord make me a Christian?' Some words of Soren Kirkegaard are appropriate, "it would be a fitting expression for a genuinely religious attitude if the individual were to say, 'I do not doubt the salvation of any human being; the only one I have fears about is myself.'"

The ecumenical scene

An open spirit has existed among the various Protestant denominations for some time. That it now also exists between Protestants and Roman Catholics is cause for great rejoicing. At long last we are able to extend the hand of friendship to one another and to own each other as brothers in Christ. What now makes it possible for us to do this? Certainly there has not been any growing together in beliefs (generally speaking). And there is not likely to be any such growth either. Even the beliefs which are shared in common are set within a matrix which could not be broken without surrendering the soul of each.

What then is the explanation of this new spirit? Is it not the living reality in our faith bursting the bounds of man's making? Some may judge the new spirit sentimental seeing that that there is at present no tangible basis to it; it may be seen as no more than an effort to attain unity for the sake of unity. Surely there is much more to it than this.

Not long ago I listened to a sermon on the radio by a Roman Catholic priest in which the new spirit was hailed enthusiastically. But, it was said, differences in belief remained to be resolved. What an impossible task! Is there no way round this? Certainly we must endeavour to understand each other but to attempt to resolve differences in belief is likely to put an end to the new attitude. A different approach must be found. Such a fundamental question as "What is Christianity?" will need to be asked and probed.

Within Protestantism, through the World Council of Churches, something more is being attempted than between Protestants and Roman Catholics. It is, however, difficult to put one's finger on it and say 'this is the

goat'. Co-operation in the World Council is on the basis of a confession of Jesus Christ as "God and Savior." Many are unhappy with this rather dubious theological statement, 'Jesus is God'. Its effect is, of course, to bolster the authoritarian structure of the World Council and to confirm Christianity to a mould. The note of rigid authoritarianism in the W.C.C. is discernable in a sentence in a book by one of its leaders, 'there is no salvation outside the church'. The unhappiness which many feel over the basis of co-operation only serves to emphasise that it would be impossible to unite the world wide church on the basis of a creed.

Dr Donald Soper has said that Christianity will find its unity not on the basis of a creed but in an attitude to God and to man (cited in a review of his book *Tower Hill 12.30* in the August issue of the *Expository Times*). The theological climate is changing: a new liberalism is gathering momentum. As His liberalism explores and uncovers the deep issues of faith enquiring into the nature of Christianity perhaps a new way forward will be found, a release from the present stalemate.

The gospel in this age

William Hamilton in his book *The New Essence of Christianity* states a case for the "fragmentation" of the Gospel, by which he means that at any particular time or in any specific situation which demands it an aspect of the Gospel has a right to prominence. In other words, and for example, should the situation demand it 'the social gospel' should be to the fore. This seems to me to give the Gospel a dynamic quality. Often we think of it in static terms, definable once and for all, and so we speak of the Gospel and its implications as if the two things could be separated. The Gospel conceived dynamically means that to be a Christian in South Africa today may not be quite the same thing as being a Christian, say, in Mexico. To be a Christian in the 20th Century is not quite the same thing as a Christian in the 17th Century. Some oft quoted words of Albert Schweitzer put in strongly and beautifully:

"He comes to us as One unknown, without a name, as of old, by the lakeside, He came to those men who knew Him not. He speaks to us the same word: 'Follow thou Me!' and sets us to the tasks which He has to fulfil for our time."

What is a Christian?

In our endeavour to throw light on this question it might seem that we have broadened the word Christian to such an extent that it ceases to have any distinctive meaning; but have we not also narrowed it so much that we are all left with a challenge and without the luxury of an ultimate comfort?

* Dr. Oglethorpe is leraar van die N.G. Kerk en is vise-prinsipaal van die Mindolo Ecumenical Foundation in Noord-Rhodesië.

* Rev. B. Gilmour is Minister of the Congregational Church (Bergvliet) in the Cape.

CHRISTUS SE BOODSKAP EN DIE KERK

Moderator spreek die Sinode van die kerk van Skotland toe.

Hier volg enkele grepe uit die toespraak van die Moderator van die Sinode van die Kerk van Skotland, volgens The Gist, 1963.

God wil dat die kerk die gewete van die volk sal wees.

As ons sendelinge na 'n ongekerstende land stuur is ons tog nie van mening dat Christus nie voor hulle daar was nie? Ewemin is ons mening dat in die gesekulariseerde maatskappy buite die grense van die kerk, waar die invloed van georganiseerde godsdiens minimaal is, die Here Christus nie teenwoordig is nie; of dat waar die kerk geen indruk maak nie, Hy nie in daad en waarheid aan die werk is nie — Hy aan wie alle mag in hemel en op aarde gegee is? As Christus nie daar is nie, buitekant die leer en die verksansing, as Hy nie deur ons gevestigde stellings heen breek nie, laat ons ophou oor evangelisasie gesels. Maar dit is juis Sy teenwoordigheid daar buitekant ons verste grense wat dit vir ons moontlik maak om te evangeliseer.

Dit is iets vreesliks as 'n groep Christene, 'n kerk, 'n godsdienstige genootskap op honsel konsentreer — op sy status, prestige, sy opgegaarde eerbiedwaardige tradisies, terwyl die hele strekking van Christus se boodskap is dat die Koninkryk van die Hemele on-eindig groter is as watter groep, teologiese rigting of kerkgemeenskap ook al ter wêreld. Want wie voortgaan om sy eie lewe te soek, sy by-enkeling of kerk, sal dit uiteindelik verloor.

Ons spreek van die „ware teenwoordigheid“ van Christus. Waar eintlik is hierdie ware teenwoordigheid aanwesig? Sonder twyfel in Woord en Sakrament, in die vergadering van die gelowiges en hul belydenisskrifte. Ja, maar ewe-goed in die vlees en bloed van elke behoeftige persoon op Gods aarde. Hier kom Christus ons tegemoet: hier is die ware teenwoordigheid waar die arm-salige vlugteling, die hongeri-ge kind, die werklose arbeider en die slagoffer van die mens se onmenslikheid teenoor sy medemens ons tegemoet tree.

Vorms van aanbidding en metodes van werk kan ont-aard tot 'n verweer-tegniek teen die ware ontmoeting met Hom wie se oë soos 'n vuur-vlam is en wie se Woord sker-per is as 'n tweesnydende swaard.

Is dit moontlik dat ons sindeloos aanhou met ons de-batte oor die verskillende ska-keringe in die betekenis van ampsbedieninge terwyl Christus voor oë staan en be-tuig: „Voor Abraham was, was Ek“? Dit blyk dat dit wel moontlik is. So ontsettend is die sonde.

Waar dit eintlik op aankom, is die geloof wat volkome staat maak op Gods Woord. Dit is die grondslag van die kerk.

Waarom is daar vandag duisende goeie mense in ons kerk vir wie die Christelike godsdiens hoofsaaklik bestaan in korrekte gedrag, verwarm deur 'n bietjie gevoeligheid en filantropie? Dit is tog nie wat

doop- en lidmaatbelofte inhou nie! Nog minder is ons predi-kante georden om so 'n soort godsdiens te verkondig. Dit het niks met die evangelie te doen wat in daardie eerste tyd soos 'n duisend trompette mense uit hul sondeslaap laat opskrik het nie.

(Uit „Inter Nos“, Aug 1963)

CHURCH IN



THE WORLD TODAY

PRO ECCLESIA

— Helsinki, Finland

COMMUNIST YOUTH FESTIVAL

The atmosphere was charged with victory! As I sat in the press box with Communist writers all about me, I was completely overwhelmed by the fantastic enthusiasm of the 35,000 people who jammed the huge stadium for the opening rally of the Communist World Youth Festival held in Helsinki, Finland recently.

Korean and Chinese delegations had arrived by special train from Moscow. Other chartered trains had brought Bulgarian representatives. On my plane had been part of the American delegation. "I just came for the thrill," said a beautiful, young, blonde college student from Chicago who had sat next to me.

An elaborate and impressive two and a half hour parade had preceded the rally. The emphatic and continuous chant of "Peace and Friendship" filled the arena as the young people from all the countries marched in their colorful, native costumes and joined in the keynote refrain.

My heart sank as I viewed the 500 American representatives. They were a motley and pathetic sight, of the beatnik, Sloppy Joe, and so-called "Peacenik" variety. I learned that they had been requested to refrain from appearing to be "better" than the young people from other countries. This, I judged, had been no effort for them.

During the parade I mingled with Communist youth from East Germany, the new African nations, and other Russian-dominated countries. I asked a Russian boy if he believed in God. "No," he replied, "how can you believe in something which does not exist." Soon I had hundreds of Russians surrounding me. Their Communist branding was evident and effective, to say the least.

It was the Finnish young people who injected a disconcerting note to the festival, which greatly provoked the wrath of the Communists. A series of riots broke out and 15,000 Finnish youth protested with frenzied cries of "Free Finland" and "Down with the Communists." One Finnish boy said to me, "We are against the Communists. That is why we are having this demonstration. We did not ask for the festival, and we hate what it stands for."

For eleven days I watched the exhibition. I have never been so shaken in my life. I have honestly been jarred right down to my soul. In the early morning hours I would walk the streets of Helsinki. I admit I was depressed. I shall never forget the terrible enthusiasm

and confidence of the Communists; nor will I forget their hatred for God and America.

The price tag on this event was twenty-five million dollars, and the Communists had been willing to pay. They had brought over 14,500 young people from all over the world, at a cost of almost \$2000 per delegate, to give their message of "Peace and Friendship," and to make their calculated impression.

What shook me most was the passion with which Communists love their ideals. I returned home with a broken heart. I am thoroughly convinced that we must have a love for Christ that is no less intense or costly, if we are to win a world. Our only answer is to give equal attention to instilling in our youth a love for our Lord Jesus and a loyalty to our beloved country.

From "The Missionary Standard", May 1963

CHURCH IS DETERMINING FACTOR IN ALL SOCIETIES, AFRICAN LEADER SAYS

(Rochester, N.Y.) — "In every society the church is the determining factor whether it is present or absent," the Reverend Jean Kotto of Africa told the Central Committee of the World Council of Churches.

Even though the Church withdraws into itself, "clinging to its traditional forms and to its obsolete message," the African churchman asserted, "its role is fundamental for all who come in contact with it."

The Rev. Mr. Kotto, general secretary of the Evangelical Church in the Cameroun, spoke on "The Church's Responsibility in the New Societies" to the Central Committee in session here.

Mr Kotto said that the role of the Church in new societies is to "adapt its message to present-day conditions in order to meet the real needs and to solve the problems confronting contemporary people in Africa, just as the Gospel met people's needs at the time of Christ."

Describing some of the principles of church-discipline in Africa to which he is opposed, Mr Kotto listed as one of them "the categorical refusal to admit polygamist who remains faithful to his wives, all working peacefully together for the good of the family, is not allowed to join the church," the churchman asserted. "His wives are also excluded, and even his children; the Church refuses to baptize them at all, even later in their lifetime, un-

WHITE SOUTH AFRICA'S DILEMMA

It is so deceptively easy for us in Asia to think resentfully, if not contemptuously, of the racial policies of the White man vis-a-vis the Negro that it may be salutary for us to probe a little deeper and find out why they act as strangely as they do. For one thing our contempt is largely a defence reaction because of our own uneasiness with our own problems. Secondly, it is based largely on ignorance and there are some things about which we have no right to be ignorant if we can possibly help it. We must be concerned not only for the despised Negro, but as Christians also for the 'White' Christian, and we must be concerned enough to pray realistically for him, and we cannot do that unless we attempt to understand him.

White Christians in South Africa are confronted by a very real dilemma. Whereas Asians rejoice at the fantastic political progress of the "new" nations in Africa, few of us are aware of the magnitude and complexity of the political and social problems created by the new situation. In South Africa, for instance, a minority of 3 million whites are confronted by 12 million non-Whites, mostly illiterate or semi-illiterate. Their temptation to stand solidly with their own group is a real one and their spiritual anguish is the greater knowing as they do that such a stand must conflict with their Christian faith.

But why are the numbers of whites in favour of apartheid increasing? Because of what is taking place in the rest of Africa. Take the Congo for example. The debacle there has

strengthened South African whites in their belief that a shared African-White society is impossible: that wherever Africans become politically dominant the White man is harshly discriminated against. Most whites do not ask why the Congo debacle occurred. The important thing is that the Belgians were driven out.

The prejudice of the white man is confirmed by what has happened in Algeria. The white French settlers there are out-numbered seven or eight to one by the Algerian Moslems, and the attempt by the French government to force integration on the Whites has resulted in a blood bath. In the Federation of the Rhodesias and Nyasaland multi-racialism has been tried but it is feared it will soon develop into a farce with the Whites at the mercy of the Africans.

An important factor in the situation is the flow into South Africa of whites from such newly or prospectively independent African countries as the Congo, Kenya and Tanganyika. Most of these people hold many grievances against the Africans and are some of the most outspoken supporters of the Verwoerd regime.

To outsiders the attitude and conduct of the South African whites may be completely out of step with the current patterns of history, and their policies in conflict with Christian values. But the majority are convinced that to open political doors to Africans is a mixed society would be the end of the White man's very existence in South Africa.

We do not want to defend the policies of Christian White South Africans. We think that the fears of the White Christian South Africans are exaggerated, but could they not with equal justice point out that we have hardly any excuse at all for our fears: for Sinhalese fears at Tamil intellectual dominance, or Buddhist fears as Catholic Action, or Tamil fears at Sinhala domination, or Christian fears at Buddhist domination?

Our disagreement with the policy of Apartheid in churches is that if our oneness in Christ is not only a spiritual unity but requires visible embodiment in the life of the Church here and now, then there cannot be separate churches. Many Christian South Africans see this very clearly and therefore their spiritual anguish is the greater. We in Asia are called not only to pray for them but to love and to understand them. For in understanding with compassion one's fellowman one comes to a deeper understanding of oneself, and only then is one saved from the ever besetting sins of hypocrisy and self-righteousness.

From: THE CHRISTIAN NEWS BULLETIN. Issued by the Study Department of the National Christian Council Colombo, Ceylon (July, 1963).

taught us a great deal: not to be hasty in condemning the attitude of these citizens of the new societies. They need to be helped, guided and strengthened. The only thing which can do this is the Christian gospel. It is a crucial moment for the future of Africa."

"The campaigns of evangelism", Mr Kotto asserted, "have

(From Information Sheet, WCC, Sept. 1963.)