



PRO VERITATE

W. A. VISSER 'T HOOFT

The Mandate of the Ecumenical Movement

SHEENA DUNCAN

Factors Peculiar to Africans in South Africa which lead to the
Disruption of Family Life

MARIE-LOUISE MARTIN

Prophetic Christianity in the Congo

Volume VII No. 4 | Jaargang VII Nr. 4

15 Aug.

By die Hoofposkantoor as Nuisblad geregistreer
Registered at the Post Office as a Newspaper

PRO VERITATE

REDAKSIE

REDAKTEUR:

Dr. B. Engelbrecht.

REDAKSIONELE KOMITEE:

Biskop B. B. Burnett; Eerw. J. de Gruchy; Eerw. A. W. Habelgaarn; Eerw. E. E. Mahabane; Eerw. J. E. Moulder; Ds. C. F. B. Naudé; (Voorsitter); Eerw. R. Orr; Prof. dr. A. van Selms.

ADMINISTRASIE/ KORRESPONDENSIE

SIRKULASIEBESTUURDER:

Dr. W. B. de Villiers.

Alle briewe vir die redaksie en administrasie aan: Posbus 31135, Braamfontein, Johannesburg.

INTEKENGELD

Intekengeld is vooruitbetaalbaar.

Land- en seepos: R1 (10/- of \$1.40) — Afrika; R1.50 (15/- of \$2.10) — Oorsee; 17/6 — Engeland.

Lugpos: R2.00 (£1 of \$2.80) — Afrika; R3.50 (£1.17.6 of \$5.00) — Oorsee; £2 — Engeland.

Tjeks en posorders moet uitgemaak word aan Pro Veritate (Edms.) Bpk., Posbus 31135, Braamfontein, Johannesburg.

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 inleidingsartikel en redaksionele verklarings nie.

PRO VERITATE verskyn elke 15de van die maand.

(Prys per enkel-eksemplaar 10c)

CHRISTELIKE MAANDBLAD VIR SUIDELIKE AFRIKA
CHRISTIAN MONTHLY FOR SOUTHERN AFRICA

IN HIERDIE UITGAWE

- By die opening van die vierde vergadering van die Wêreldraad van Kerke, Uppsala, Julie 1968, het dr. W. A. Visser 't Hooft gepraat oor die opdrag van die ekumeniese beweging. Bl. 4
- Mev. Sheena Duncan bespreek faktore in ons huidige maatskaplike stelsel wat gesinsverbrokkeling onder die Bantoebevolking van ons land baie sterk bevorder. Bl. 10
- Prof. B. B. Keet skryf oor die mening van 'n bekende Gereformeerde teoloog oor die Wêreldraad van Kerke. Bl. 13
- In die eerste van 'n reeks van drie artikels oor die Kimbangukerk in die Kongo, skryf dr. Marie-Louise Martin oor die oorsprong en geskiedenis van die Kimbangu-beweging. Dr. Martin is tans dosent aan die teologiese fakulteit van die Universiteit van Botswana, Lesotho en Swaziland te Roma, Lesotho. Bl. 14

IN THIS ISSUE . .

- At the opening of the Fourth Assembly of the World Council of Churches, Uppsala, July 1968, Dr. W. A. Visser 't Hooft spoke on The Mandate of the Ecumenical Movement. P. 4
- Mrs. Sheena Duncan discusses some factors in our present social system which seriously contribute to the disruption of family life among the African population of our country. P. 10
- Prof. B. B. Keet writes about the views of a well-known Reformed theologian on the World Council of Churches. P. 13
- In the first of a series of three articles on the Kimbanguist Church in the Congo, Dr. Marie-Louise Martin writes about the origin and history of the Kimbanguist movement. Dr. Martin is Reader in Theology at the university of Botswana, Lesotho and Swaziland at Roma, Lesotho. P. 14

Inleidingsartikel

Roekeloosheid in die Goeie Stryd

Dat die Christendom in Suid-Afrika nie slegs voor 'n enorme uitdaging staan nie maar inderdaad in 'n krisis-uur verkeer, moet deur almal besef word wat oor die toekoms van ons land besorgd is. Meer as drie eeue van Christendom hier te lande, van toegewyde kersteningsarbeid en ongeëwenaarde offervaardigheid, het die uitdaging nie kleiner gemaak of die krisis afgewend nie. Wel het dit aan almal, uit watter bevolkingsgroep, ras of stand ook al, 'n belangrike toerusting verskaf om die situasie gelowig en hoopvol die hoof te bied.

Die tyd is verby dat die Christendom in Suid-Afrika sy besondere uitdaging en 'n volledige omskrywing van sy taak in die verband, kon sien as die verkondiging van die evangelie aan die heidene en filantropiese arbeid onder die minder-bevoorregtes van 'n barbaardom. Oor wat bereik is, sal niemand geringskattend mag praat of oordeel nie. Dit betrou ons om dankbaar te glo dat arbeid en offers nie tevergeefs was nie.

Ons staan egter in die baai van 'n totaal ander bedeling wat die Christendom in ons land, soos trouens ook in ander lande in menige opsig, min of meer onverhoeds oorval het. Alle probleme wat die tegnologiese rewolusie en die verstedeliking en massalising van die gemeenskap elders in die wêreld meegebring het, word ook in ons land in toenemende mate ervaar. En dit word vir ons boonop verhewig deur die tergende vraagstuk van onderlinge verhoudinge in 'n bevolkingsgeheel waarvan die samestelling gekenmerk word deur 'n verskeidenheid van volke en rasse wat in baie opsigte grondig van mekaar verskil. Die taak waarvoor die Christendom in ons land staan, het verskuif van 'n betreklik ongekompliseerde, hoewel moeilike en veeleisende, kersteningsarbeid onder die heidene na die ordening van hierdie heterogeen-saamgestelde eenheidsgemeenskap en die inrigting daarvan op die grondslae van die geregtigheid en die liefde, sodat die land vir almal bewoonbaar en die lewe vir almal leefbaar mag wees, en die lewe hier in vrede geleef kan word.

Suid-Afrika het sy probleme nie self gekies nie. Dit sal ook nie met reg beweer kan word dat hy dit vir homself geskep het nie. Hy is eenvoudig daarin gestel. En wat daar ook al van ons land gesê mag word, een ding staan vas en strek tot sy onbetwisbare eer. Dit is dat daar terdeë besef word dat ons ons bevind in 'n uiters gekompliseerde probleem-situasie waarvan die kerklike sowel as die politieke leiding weet dat 'n Christelike oplossing daarvoor gesoek moet word. Ons het dit aanvaar as „die goeie stryd”. As dit êrens ter wêreld maar duidelik is hoe sterk die politieke leiding aangewese is op die lig van Gods Woord en die riglyne uit die Skrif, dan is dit Suid-Afrika.

Die stryd waarin ons gewikkel is om ons land as die tuiste van al sy inwoners in te rig, kan veral ook deur diegene wat aan die leiding staan, slegs nog sinvol en hoopvol gevoer word as die goeie stryd van die geloof.

Dit beteken dat alle vooropgesette ideologieë wat op een of ander stelsel van vereenvoudiging berus, deur almal wat mede-verantwoordelik is vir die uitwerking van ons heil „met vrees en bewing”, uitgeskakel en verniy moet word.

Met watter opreg Christelike motiewe daar ook al aanvaar mag gewees het dat die beleid van apartheid sowel 'n oplossing is as die weg wat vir ons veelrassige land in die Skrif gedikteer word, ons word al hoe meer tot die insig gedwing dat ons in albei opsigte grootliks gedwaal het. As 'n klaarblyklike kort-termyn „oplossing” is dit inderdaad géén oplossing nie maar 'n wanhoops-uitvlug waarmee ons bowendien in botsing gekom het met die Skrif en met die algemene Christelike oortuiging. Wie daarvoor tog nog met die Bybel in die hand die pleit wil voer en kragtens sy persoonlike of ampsoutoriteit daarmee 'n weg aanwys wat deur 'n volgelingskap met oortuiging bewandel word, tree roekeloos op in ons „goeie stryd” en lei sekerlik nie, maar verlei.

Aan die ander kant sou dit ook net so roekeloos wees om die grondliggende oorsaak van ons probleme, nl. die feit van ons veelrassige bevolkingsamestelling, ideologiserend te vereenvoudig of te probeer wegpraat asof dit geen faktor is waarmee daar rekening gehou behoort of hoef te word nie. In die praktiese verwerkliking van 'n konsekwent deurgevoerde integrasie kan dit straks blyk dat die vurigste pleitbesorgers daarvan die minste bereid mag wees om die volle konsekwensies daarvan te aanvaar.

Dit ly geen twyfel nie dat verabsolutering van die een sowel as van die ander onrealisties en fataal is. Dit bring radikale verdelinge mee in geledere wat ten minste op die punt van 'n eerlike soeke geslote behoort te wees. Niemand het nog die sleutel ontdek tot die ontsluiting van 'n toekoms vir ons land waarin 'n leefbare en gelukkige lewe vir almal gewaarborg is nie. Dis nóg apartheid nóg integrasie. In hulle verabsoluteerde vorme is die een 'n stommitieit en die ander 'n gekheid, 'n Middeweg tussen die twee is egter ewe ondenkbaar as „oplossing”.

Juis in hierdie dilemma is die gesprek (hoe gesmaad ook al) 'n onontbeerlike noodsaaklikheid wat gevoer moet word onder nugtere aanvaarding van die feit dat dit ewe noodsaaklik is dat daar intussen, so goed en so kwaad soos dit kom, ook gehandel moet word.

Die Christelike getuienis het hierin 'n primêre aandeel en verantwoordelikheid. Juis hier moet daar besef word dat die Skrif nie as politieke handboek gebruik kan word soos wat sommige wel meen om dit te gebruik bv. in vrâe in verband met die sedeleer nie. Maar dit staan ook vas dat ons sonder die Skrif tevergeefs sal soek na die regte weg in die labirint waarin ons verkeer. Die Christelike geloof staan daarop dat die wil van God tot heil van ons ganse lewe in die Skrif aan ons geopenbaar is. As ons ons lig egter wel in die Skrif wil vind, sal daar opgehou moet word om dit willekeurig te hanteer as 'n soort diktaat uit die hemel waarmee ons vroeg en laat wil bewys dat die weg wat vir ons die aanneemlikste lyk, die een is waarvoor ons ons op die outoriteit van God self kan beroep. Dit sal vir ons moet gaan om die geheel van die Skrifgetuienis aangaande God se bedoeling met sy wêreld, en in gehoorsaamheid aan sy eise van liefde en geregtigheid sal ons moet soek om die inrigting van ons samelewing met daardie bedoeling in ooreenstemming te bring. Dit is iets totaal anders as 'n soeke van die „goue middeweg” — nie alte konserwatief nie en nie alte liberaal nie, nie alte vroom nie en nie alte goddeloos nie — tussen twee uiterstes.

Kompromisse sal op hierdie weg wel in oorgloed tot stand kom, soos wat die oorgang van geloof in lewe altyd wesenlik en noodwendig in die kompromisvorm geskied. Maar ook dit is iets totaal anders as 'n ombuiging van die Skrif om ons 'eie weg van die minste weerstand goddelik te sanksioneer.

Die gesprek moet voortgaan. Nader aan Die Waarheid sal ons nie kom as deur steeds daarna te soek, en volgens die lig wat ons voortdurend weer ontvang, te handel nie — in die relatiewiteit, en daarom steeds onder die oordeel van God wat 'n genadige oordeel is waar ons met 'n ernstige voorneme nie alleen na sommige nie, maar na al die geboie van God begin lewe (Die Heidelbergse Kategismus, Antw. 114). Daarom word daar tewens roekeloos gehandel in ons „goeie stryd” as medesoekers na die waarheid uitgeskakel word deur persone en instansies wat optree met die pretensie dat die onfeilbare resep vir die oplossing van ons probleme reeds gevind is en dat daar in die inrigting van ons volkslewe slegs maar dien-ooreenkomstig gehandel moet word.

Editorial

Recklessness in the Good Fight

All who are concerned with the future of our country must realise that Christianity in South Africa is not only confronted by an enormous challenge but is actually placed in an hour of crisis. The challenge has not been diminished nor the crisis averted by dedicated missionary activity and an unrivalled willingness to make sacrifices in more than three centuries of Christianity in this country. What it indeed did do was to provide all of us, from whatever population group, race or class, with important equipment with which to face the situation faithfully and hopefully.

The time is past when Christianity in South Africa could see its peculiar challenge and a complete delineation of its task in this connection as the preaching of the gospel to the heathen and philanthropical work among the less privileged members of an uncivilised society. No one dare speak or judge disparagingly concerning what has been achieved. It befits us gratefully to believe that the work and sacrifices were not in vain.

We are, however, caught up in the chaos of a totally different dispensation which has more or less unexpectedly overwhelmed Christianity in our country, as, in fact, also happened in other countries in many respects. All the problems following in the train of the technological revolution and the mass urbanisation of the community elsewhere in the world are also increasingly being experienced in our country. And these are in addition intensified

for us by the tantalising question of mutual relationships in a population whose composition is characterised by a diversity of peoples and races which radically differ from each other in many respects. The task confronting Christianity in our country has shifted from a relatively uncomplicated, though difficult and demanding, work of christianisation among the heathen to the ordering of this heterogeneously composed unitary community and its arrangement on the foundations of justice and love, so that the country may be habitable and life livable for all, and life may here be lived in peace.

South Africa is not confronted by problems of its own choosing. It can also not be justly alleged that it created them for itself. It is simply placed in the situation. And whatever may be said of our country, one thing is certain and redounds to its undeniable credit. This is that it is realised all too well that we are placed in an extremely complicated problem-situation and that both the ecclesiastical and political leadership know that a Christian solution must be sought. We have accepted this as "the good fight". If anywhere in the world it is all too clear how strongly the political leadership is directed to God's Word and the guide rules of Scripture, then it is surely South Africa. The battle in which we are engaged to establish our country as the home of all its inhabitants can be conducted sensibly and hopefully, especially by those who are in command, only as the good fight of faith.

This means that all preconceived ideologies which are based on some system of simplification or other must be eliminated and avoided by all who are co-responsible for the bringing about of our salvation "in fear and trembling".

However genuinely Christian the motives with which it may have been accepted that the policy of apartheid were both a solution and the way dictated in Scripture for our multiracial country, we are increasingly brought to the realisation that we have grievously erred in both respects. As an obviously short term "solution" it is in fact no solution at all but a policy of desperation, through which we have in addition come into conflict with Scripture and with universally-held Christian conviction. He who nevertheless insists on advocating it, Bible in hand, and indicating it as a way which can be followed with conviction by his following on the strength of his personal or official authority, is acting recklessly in our "good fight" and is certainly not leading, but misleading.

On the other hand, it would be just as misleading to simplify in terms of an ideology or to make light of the basic cause of our problems, viz. the fact of the multiracial composition of our population, as if it were no factor which ought or has to be reckoned with. In the practical realisation of an integration carried through to its logical consequences it may well prove that its most ardent advocates may be the least prepared to accept it.

There can be no doubt that absolutising either of them would be both unrealistic and fatal. Absolute ideologies bring about radical divisions in ranks which should be closed at least on the point of an honest search. Nobody **has** yet discovered the key which will unlock a future for our country in which a livable and happy life for all is guaranteed. It is neither apartheid nor integration. In their absolute forms the one is stupidity and the other madness. A middle way between the two is, however, equally unthinkable as a "solution".

It is precisely in this dilemma that dialogue (however much maligned) is an indispensable necessity which has to be conducted with sober acceptance of the fact that it is equally necessary that action should also be taken in the meantime, whether for better or for worse.

Christian witness has a primary share and responsibility in this. It is precisely here that it must be realised that Scripture cannot be used as a political text book as some regard themselves justified in doing, for example, in questions with regard to morals. But it is also beyond all doubt that without Scripture we will look in vain for the right way out of the labyrinth in which we find ourselves. Christian faith insists that the will of God for the salvation of our whole life is revealed to us in Scripture. If indeed we wish to find our enlightenment in Scripture, however, we shall have to cease using it arbitrarily as a kind of dictate from heaven with which we seek to prove at all times that the way which appears most acceptable to us is the one concerning which we can appeal to the authority of God Himself. Our concern will have to be the whole of Scriptural witness about God's purpose with His world, and in obedience to His demands of justice and love we shall have to seek to bring the arrangement of our society into line with that purpose. This is something completely different from a search for the "golden mean" — not too conservative and not too liberal, not over much righteous and not over much wicked — between the two extremes.

In the process, to be sure, compromises aplenty will come about; just as the transition from faith to life always occurs, essentially and necessarily, in the form of compromise. But this too is something quite different from a bending around of Scripture in order to sanction our own way of the least resistance.

The dialogue must continue. We shall never get closer to the truth than in steadily searching for it, and by acting in accordance with the light we receive ever and anon — in relativity, and therefore always under the judgment of God which is a merciful judgment when, with serious intent, we start living not only in accordance with some, but with all of God's commandments (The Heidelberg Catechism, Answer 114). That is also why it represents reckless participation in our "good fight" when fellow-seekers after the truth are eliminated by persons and bodies who act with the conceit that the infallible recipe for the solution of our problems has already been found and that all that remains to be done is to act in accordance with it in the arrangement of the life of our people.

Who is our God?

For a very large number of people, god is a small round ball! Indeed the various forms of ball worship are very like the different christian churches. If the qualities of a god are known through his adherents, then in many ways the Ball god is a better god than the Sunday god of some nominal christians. The Ball god's disciples often show more good fellowship and genuine friendship than those of the Sunday god,

who often seem divided into fractions.

The Ball god has his temples, which need upkeep, and his followers pay regular subscriptions to him. Each 'worship' session sees a small 'fellowship feast', and on special occasions the whole 'congregation' gathers for a major celebration.

Who is our God? Do we reveal His nature in our lives? Does the God we worship have more meaning

to us than the Ball god? Are our lives transformed by His presence? If not then how can we expect the Ball worshippers to be attracted to Him?

What is the essential life-giving element which transforms the God of Christ and through those who really worship Him, the world?

Rosemary M. Elliot.

The Mandate of the Ecumenical Movement

(Address delivered at the Fourth Assembly of the World Council of Churches, Uppsala, July 1968)

— Dr. W. A. Visser 't Hooft

STOCKHOLM 1925

At the moment when a world assembly of the churches begins its work in this country and in this place my thoughts go naturally to the very first ecumenical assembly of the churches which I attended in 1925 as a very young participant, namely the Stockholm Conference on Life and Work. That conference had a close relation to Uppsala. For it was in the Archbishop's palace in this city that Archbishop Söderblom laid the foundations of this pioneer-meeting, an astounding achievement at a time when the churches had yet to be convinced that this plan without precedent was not just a castle in the air and at a time when there was no such thing as a staff of ecumenical workers. The closing meetings of the conference were held in the cathedral here and in the university. The young Dag Hammarskjöld, a son of the provincial governor and a friend of the Söderblom family, was one of the stewards and thus got his first introduction to the problem of management of an international assembly, not realising that this would become his chief task in his later years. We have reason to take our stewards seriously; there may be a future Secretary General of the United Nations among them.

The days of a generation in the ecumenical movement are — to use the Psalmist words — just "a few handbreaths" (Ps. 39:5). For only two or three participants of the 1925 meeting are also participants in this Assembly.

At first sight it would seem that there is an enormous difference between Stockholm 1925 and Uppsala 1968. As a first attempt to bring together all the churches, Stockholm was more successful than most had dared to expect, but it was still far from being fully ecumenical. The American, British and European sections had sent large numbers of delegates, but of the Orthodox Churches only six had sent delegations and the fifth section, oddly designated as that of "other churches", and meant to include all of Africa, Asia and Latin America, had a very small group of delegates from only four countries. We have reason to be deeply grateful that in the relatively short period since 1925 the ecumenical movement has become more truly ecumenical and that this Assembly embraces a much larger part of Christendom. No less significant is that at the time of the Stockholm Conference the Roman Catholic Church stood quite outside the ecumenical movement and that today this great church is an active participant in the movement, which collaborates in many ways with our

World Council and which will through its official observers undoubtedly make an important contribution to our discussions.

There are many other differences, but it is perhaps more important for us today to consider the points of analogy and similarity. The real significance of the 1925 meeting was that after a very long period in which the churches had made no serious effort to understand the changing social and international realities and to help men to find illumination in the Gospel for their common life, now made a common attempt to rediscover their task with regard to the world. What Söderblom had in mind is best illustrated by a sentence of his sermon at the closing service in Uppsala cathedral. He said that the divisions and silence of the churches impeded the work of the Saviour. In other words there was one task with two aspects: to manifest the oneness of the people of God and to enable it to witness with a common voice to the full gospel of salvation with its definite implications for the world.

The responsible organisers of the conference believed that this task could be performed without raising the doctrinal issues which had divided the churches and which would be the specific theme of the Faith and Order movement. They were right in so far that the Stockholm

Conference did not become a dialogue between the various confessions. But in another way the conferences became much more theological and less practical than had been anticipated. For its unofficial main theme had become in fact the profound question of the right attitude of the church to the world. It is interesting that Bishop Brent, the founder of Faith and Order, who chaired the sub-committee on "The Church and International Relations", wrote in the report which he submitted to the conference that "in the inner history of Christendom during the last two centuries there have been two contrasted types of Christian piety — the eschatological and individualistic on the one hand, the social and universal on the other". Bishop Brent recommended that the conference should consider the question "how to combine Christian international activity with Christian inwardness." And this became indeed the great issue. A strongly eschatological conception of the Kingdom of God clashed with the social gospel and its vision of the gradual growth of the Kingdom through the application of Christian principles to society.

We do not speak the same language as the fathers of 1925. The theological positions have shifted. But is it not true that we are still struggling with the same basic theme? This assembly will largely be judged according to its capacity to speak a helpful word on the same question of the task of the church in the world. Our very theme: "I make all things new" obliges us to face once again the question what the eschatological hope means for our life and action in history. Faith and Order itself has set its concern for Church unity in the context of a study on "God in nature and history". And practically all other subjects which we will discuss together, will be discussed against the background of the decisive question: "What is the mandate of the Church in relation to the world?"

Can we learn anything from our own ecumenical history in this respect? I believe we can and I should therefore like to invite you to undertake a very rapid journey through the years from 1925 to our time.

HISTORY'S LESSONS

Stockholm had in so far left the churches in the air, that it had spoken strongly of the need for a Christian witness in society, but had said very little about the content of that witness and about the way in which it was to be given. It was largely taken for granted that the world knew quite well what the Christian ethic was and needed only to be exhorted to take it seriously. The churches did not yet realise that the very foundations of the Christian faith were being challenged. A few years later that challenge became unmistakably clear through the church conflict in Germany. Under the prophetic and energetic leadership of Dr. J. H. Oldham it was therefore decided that the second world conference on Life and Work in Oxford in 1937 would concentrate on the issue of the Christian view of society, of the state and of international relations in response to the various totalitarian challenges. But as the preparations proceeded it became clear that it would not be sufficient to talk about Christian principles. For we saw before our eyes that these principles would remain utterly irrelevant unless there existed a community which would embody these convictions and would make them manifest. But did such a community exist? Or had the churches become so largely a part of their surrounding societies that they could no longer speak the prophetic word to them? Thus Life and Work was forced to face the issue of the nature and task of the Church. The Oxford slogan: "Let the Church be the Church" was not an invention of panic-stricken ecclesiastics seeking to withdraw into the safety of their church institutions. It was a battle-cry calling the churches to a true obedience as the people who really know that their Lord has overcome the world and who now practice in the world that newness of life which must penetrate into all realms of human relations. It is obvious that this insight helped powerfully to prepare the ground for the great decision of the two 1937

conferences on Life and Work and on Faith and Order to create together a World Council of Churches. For Faith and Order had since its inception been inspired by the conviction that the visible unity of the Church was both a necessity arising from its very nature and a condition for the fulfilment of its task in the world. There were some who doubted the wisdom of placing the responsibility for the main stream of the ecumenical movement so squarely on the churches and who would have preferred to continue with a less formal and less official structure. But the great majority — and among them in leading positions laymen such as Mott and Oldham and many other men deeply concerned for the social and international task of Christianity — believed that, if Christendom was to fulfil its calling, it should have the courage to enter into history and to enter into history implied the use of the given historical instruments, that is of the historical churches.

We knew well that these churches would need a thorough renewal, if they were to become the conscience of society. All during the war and very especially at the first Assembly at Amsterdam that theme of renewal was the basic motive of ecumenical thought. The call to the first Assembly written by Bishop George Bell (of Chichester) said: "Our first and deepest need is not new organisation, but the renewal, or rather the re-birth of the actual churches. May God grant that we hear the call of the Spirit". And that first Assembly of 1948 — now 20 years ago — saw that renewal in the light of Söderblom's hope: that the covenant made by the churches would enable the churches to render a better witness with regard to the life of mankind. The Message said: "Our coming together to form a World Council will be vain unless Christians and Christian congregations everywhere commit themselves to the Lord of the Church in a new effort to seek together, where they live, to be his witnesses and servants among their neighbours. We have to remind ourselves and all men that God has put down the mighty from their seats and exalted the humble".

During the nearly twenty years between Stockholm (1925) and Evanston (1954) the old question of the relevance of biblical eschatology, the Stockholm issue, had been much

discussed, but no attempt had been made to formulate a common answer on this subject. The Advisory Commission on the theme of the Second Assembly "Christ the Hope of the World" received the formidable assignment to do just this. The Evanston Assembly did not adopt its report, but the basic convictions underlying that report came to be widely accepted and exerted a deep influence on the development of the ecumenical discussion in the following years. Evanston made clear that eschatology as the dimension of God's final purpose and final action of salvation must not be considered as an appendix to the faith, but rather permeate the whole life of the Church. True eschatology does not put the church to sleep. For as the report said: The Church "is the company of watchmen, who because they have seen the light in the east, know that the new day has already broken and are sounding the trumpets to announce it to all their fellows. It is the fellowship of those who now in this very time are able to recognise the coming King in His hungry, thirsty, naked, sick, captive and refugee brethren and are accordingly willing and ready in His name to give them food and drink and clothing, to visit them and company with them." By showing that the Christian hope is a productive hope Evanston helped to overcome the gap between the verticalists with their tendency to otherworldliness and the horizontalists with their tendency to this-worldliness.

Had the old inherent tension in the life of the ecumenical movement thus been overcome? The following years showed that the issue of church and world is a perennial issue, that we can never say that the debate is closed, that we can only continue to live with the issue and struggle with it.

But that brings us to our present situation, for what happened in the last ten years is really more the present than the past.

WHERE DO WE STAND TODAY?

It seems to me that the present ecumenical situation can only be described in the paradoxical statement that the ecumenical movement has entered into a period of reaping an astonishing rich harvest but that precisely at this moment the move-

ment is more seriously called in question than ever before. And once again the basic issue is that of the relation between church and world.

I need not develop why we can speak of the success of the ecumenical movement. We need only to think of this Assembly in comparison to earlier ecumenical world conferences. Who would have dared to believe in 1925 or even in 1948 that by 1968 we would have reached the point at which practically all Eastern Orthodox Churches would bring their much-needed contribution, at which Africa, Asia and Latin America would have such a distinctive word to speak, and in which through a great network of close fraternal relationships the Roman Catholic Church after having elaborated its own position concerning the central ecumenical issues, would enrich and stimulate our discussions so greatly? We are near the point when Söderblom's dream will come true: that all churches of Christendom can speak out together on the great problems of mankind. And as the various main streams of the ecumenical movement have joined together we have a greater opportunity than ever to act in the field of evangelism and mission, of faith and order, of life and work as one well co-ordinated world-wide Christian movement. But at this very moment there are many inside and outside our churches, particularly among the younger generation, who have their deep doubts about the relevance of the ecumenical movement and turn away from it with a sense of disappointment. So our very success is ambiguous. And once again it is the decisive issue of the relation between the church and the world which claims the centre of the stage.

For we hear it said that the ecumenical movement as it has developed over the last forty or fifty years is unable to help the churches to perform that mission which they should perform in the world of our time. That world requires radical renewal. But how can churches speak convincingly of radical renewal, if they are not radically renewed themselves? That world needs a thorough transformation of its traditional structures, but do not the churches exemplify that traditional structures resist such transformation? That world must become a world-wide responsible society, but are the churches themselves living as a re-

sponsible society in which full solidarity in service and mission is practised and in which all members, including all lay-men and women, are able to bear their full share of responsibility for the common life?

Or again this world needs effective unity. But is the relationship which the churches have in the ecumenical movement more than a pale reflection of the unity they should have? And is the progress toward full unity not so slow that it reveals rather a fear of unity than a great and passionate conviction about the essential oneness of the people of God? And must we therefore not admit that the ecumenical movement has had its time, and that we have now entered into the "post-ecumenical" age in which Christians will have to make their contribution and render their service to the world through other, less cumbersome channels?

Such questions are being asked in many places and we have every reason to take them seriously. It is inevitable that they lead also to a new discussion within our own ranks. Once again we have to face the old issue of the true relation between the Church and the world and between the vertical and horizontal dimensions of the Christian faith. My hope is that at this Assembly we will deal with it positively and ecumenically. Positively in the sense that we give a clear sense of orientation to our movement. Ecumenically in the sense that we will truly listen to each other and not write others off as brothers who are so weak in the faith that they do not deserve our attention. And also ecumenically in that the generations do not treat each other as strangers; that the older ones do not pretend that all the real questions have already been answered in ecumenical history and the younger ones do not claim that ecumenical history is a tale told, if not by an idiot, at least by a spokesman of the hopeless establishment.

As a contribution to the discussion of these crucial questions I would now make the following four points:-

1. No horizontal advance without vertical orientation

I believe that with regard to the great tension between the vertical interpretation of the Gospel as essentially concerned with God's

saving action in the life of individuals and the horizontal interpretation of it as mainly concerned with human relationships in the world we must get out of that rather primitive oscillating movement of going from one extreme to the other, which is not worthy of a movement which by its nature seeks to embrace the truth of the gospel in its fulness. A Christianity which has lost its vertical dimension has lost its salt and is not only insipid in itself, but useless for the world. But a Christianity which would use the vertical preoccupation as a means to escape from its responsibility for and in the common life of man is a denial of the incarnation, of God's love for the world manifested in Christ.

The whole secret of the Christian faith is that it is man-centred because it is God-centred. We cannot speak of Christ as the man for others without speaking of Him as the man who came from God and who lived for God.

This is a very practical truth. For on it depends the relevance of the Christian witness in the world. Let me illustrate this by referring to one of the most important problems on our agenda.

We are all deeply concerned over the problem of international social justice with its different aspects of the increasing danger of famine-conditions in large parts of the world, of the slow pace of development and of the growing tension between the affluent nations and those which live in conditions of poverty. We are profoundly disturbed by the fact that the attempts to deal with this most acute human problem are quite inadequate, so that, as Dr. Prebitsch has said, the decade of development has become the decade of frustration over development. It is not that we do not know what should be done. The experts, including several who have participated in our World Conference for Church and Society and its follow-up meetings, have worked out specific plans which would go a very long way in meeting the need. But these plans are not being carried out. Why not? Because they require that much larger amounts be made available for this purpose and that much closer collaboration be achieved between all the nations concerned. And the governments are at present not able to promise more aid and to enter into more far-reaching agreements because there is

no sufficiently strong and clear public opinion which would back them up in such a course of action. For public opinion in the West is today rather tired of the issues of development. There seem to be so many urgent tasks in our immediate environment. And the arguments used to "sell" development seem to have lost their force. The economic argument that development is good for the growth of trade is not very convincing when the Western world is so obviously able to make tremendous progress on the basis of its own inherent strength. The political argument that we cannot afford to let the tension between the rich and the poor parts of the world grow to the point of explosion carries little weight when a few great powers have the means to dominate the international political situation. And so we seem to be condemned to let the situation drift, and hand to our children a world in which there will be famine and despair and as an inevitable result even more violence than we have already known in our time.

What can the churches do about this? They can adopt resolutions and reports. But will that make much difference? The crisis is a crisis of motivation, of fundamental attitudes. The deep trouble lies underneath the political and economic level. The root of the matter is that at a time when history requires that humanity should live as a coherent responsible society men still refuse to accept responsibility for their fellow-beings.

Now we can of course seek to awaken a sense of solidarity with and sympathy for the needy. We do so with some success. And we must go on doing this. But that is not the radical operation which is needed. That does not lead to a changing of the structures of world-economy; that does not lead to a full acceptance of responsibility so that the economically weak in one part of the world are as a matter of course assisted by the economically strong in other parts of the world, just as this happens in our modern welfare-states. No, what is needed is nothing less than a new conception of humanity.

New in relation to our present situation. Not new in an absolute sense. For as we look all over the place for the vision of humanity which we need, we are like the explorer who sought a new country

and discovered his own country. For it is in our Holy Scriptures that the unity of mankind is proclaimed in the most definite manner.

The churches have not taken that proclamation seriously enough. They are largely responsible for the false impression that Christians are advocates of the Church and leave the advocacy of humanity to the philosophers, the humanists, the Marxists. But the fact is that the vision of the oneness of humanity is an original and essential part of the biblical revelation. Centuries before Alexander the Great's Oikoumene began to give Mediterranean man an idea of a wider human family, Israel had already recorded its insight that all men are made in the image of God, that they share a common task: to have dominion over the earth, that all were together included in the covenant of God's patience, made with Noah; that all are to be blessed in Abraham. And the Second Isaiah had already prophesied in one of his songs concerning the Servant of Jahveh that he would be "a covenant of humanity" and a light to the nations. (For it seems clear that in Isaiah 42:6 the word "am" really means "humanity"). This prophecy is fulfilled in Jesus Christ. He is the manifestation of God's love for the whole of mankind. He dies for all and inaugurates the new humanity as the second Adam. When it is said that God makes all things new this means above all that through Christ God re-creates humanity as a family united under his reign.

Mankind is one, not in itself, not because of its own merits or qualities. Mankind is one as the object of God's love and saving action. Mankind is one because of its common calling. The vertical dimension of its unity determines the horizontal dimension.

So Christians have more reason than anyone else to be advocates of humanity. They are not humanitarians in the sentimental sense that it is nice to be nice to other people. They are not humanists in the aristocratic sense that learning and culture constitute a bond between the privileged few of all nations. They are on the side of *all* humanity because God is on that side and His Son died for it. So they do not get so easily discouraged when the service of mankind proves to be a much tougher task than was anticipated. They do not say: we will let you

have economic justice, if you fulfil my conditions. For it is their very *raison d'être* as followers of Christ to ensure that his suffering brothers receive what they need.

It seems to me that no amount of resolution-making and moralising can help us in our present predicament, if we do not first recover in theology, in our teaching and in our preaching the clear biblical doctrine of the unity of mankind and so give our churches the strong foundation for a new approach to the whole question of world economic justice and to a better and more convincing motivation for development aid. It must become clear that church members who deny in fact their responsibility for the needy in any part of the world are just as much guilty of heresy as those who deny this or that article of the faith. The unity of mankind is not a fine ideal in the clouds; it is part and parcel of God's own revelation. Here if anywhere the vertical, God-given, dimension is essential for any action on the horizontal, inter-human plan.

2. The ecumenical movement and the churches need each other

It is not difficult to understand why the question is raised whether the ecumenical movement should be so largely in the hands of the churches. Churches stand not only for the great common Christian Tradition, but also for the many separate and historically conditioned traditions, not all of which have theological dignity. From a purely sociological standpoint churches must be classified as institutions which offer the most tenacious resistance to attempts at reformation and renewal. How then can an ecumenical movement which seeks to speak to the condition of our rapidly changing society and which would proclaim the need of renewal in all spheres of life lean so heavily on the churches? Should we not reverse the direction which the ecumenical movement took in the 1930's, give up the struggle to mobilise the churches for their new common tasks and follow the exhortations of the prophets of the "post-ecumenical" era in order to concentrate our attention exclusively on the urgent tasks in the world without wasting time on efforts to renew the Churches?

I feel the force of this question. In a sense we have asked for this reaction. For we have in all our

churches and in the World Council talked so much about renewal and about the true mission of the Church, but we have made so little real progress toward the realisation of that renewal and the true accomplishment of that mission, that the reaction is inevitable. Was it then a mistake to form a World Council of Churches and so to give the churches a central place in the ecumenical movement? I am convinced that it was not a mistake and that the 1937 decision hold good in 1968. In the ecumenical movement there has always been an important place for movements which are not dependent on the churches. They have pioneered, they must continue to challenge and stimulate us. But an ecumenical movement which would not be supported and carried by the churches would become a castle in the air. It would not be a movement representing the faith in the Incarnation. It would deny one of the basic discoveries of ecumenical history that the *Una Sancta* is not a beautiful ideal, but a God given reality which demands concrete manifestation. It would not be more truly involved in the decisive spiritual, cultural, social battles of our time. It would be less, not more concerned with the real world of human history. In order to act in society Christians must have identity with recognisable structures of common life. If the world, as Stockholm said, is too strong for a divided Church, it is surely too strong for Christians who do not seek to live as a people with a peculiar calling and thus fail to incarnate the mandate which they have received from their Lord. We do not have a chance to make a real impact on the great decisions which mankind has to take in the field of international economic justice, of peace and war and so many other fields unless we use the tremendous spiritual potentiality still largely hidden in the Christian churches.

But it must be added immediately that the churches also need the ecumenical movement. For it is largely through that movement that the pressure for true renewal is exercised. God knows that they need that pressure. The Amsterdam Assembly spoke of the mutual correction which the churches are meant to receive from each other. We may gratefully say that in the course of the last twenty years there have been signs that this process of correction in

which the World Council can play a decisive role, is actually in operation. The gifts of the Spirit are being shared. East and West, younger and older churches, and since Vatican II the Roman Catholic Church and the other churches receive gifts from each other "for the upbuilding of the body". But still it is only a small beginning. At the present moment we need especially a far more intensive dialogue between the churches of the Eastern Orthodox and those of the Western tradition — a dialogue which requires much imagination and patience on both sides, but which can lead to a great enrichment and deepening of the ecumenical movement. If we really lived according to the pattern of I Corinthians 12, if we really had a common market for the charismata, we would not need to worry about lack of new life in our churches. The time has come for the churches to open their eyes and discover the unspeakable gift which God offers them in the new opportunities for living together as members of the one body which receives the many gifts from the one spirit.

3. Church unity is important

It is natural that many inside and outside the churches wonder whether we, in the ecumenical movement, do not attach an exaggerated importance to the question of church-unity. Some have no interest in that question because they consider that the differences between the churches are disappearing anyway. They find Christians in other churches with whom they feel closer kinship than with many in their own church. Others feel that church-unity might aggravate the institutionalist tendencies in church life and create even less flexible structures than we have today. I believe that we must hold on to the original conviction of the ecumenical movement, that it belongs to the very nature of the people of God to live as one reconciled and therefore united family and that it belongs to its witness to present to the world the image of a new humanity which knows no walls of separation within its own life. Even the best co-operation and the most intensive dialogue are no substitutes for full fellowship in Christ.

But I wonder at the same time whether it is not largely our own fault that so many conceive of unity

in terms of uniformity and centralisation and are therefore afraid of it. Should we not have learned after these decades of common life in the ecumenical movement that the Holy Spirit has used very many different forms of church-order for His work of inspiration, conversion and prophesy? And have we given sufficient attention to the indisputable fact that the earliest Church knew several quite distinct types of church order? My point is simply that there seems to be no really urgent reason to identify unity with acceptance of one and the same church order. Do we not discover in our increasingly pluralistic cultural situation that what is good for one continent or region is not necessarily good for another? And must we not draw the conclusion that there can be real fellowship in faith and in sacrament even when structures differ?

In any case it remains a central part of the mandate of the ecumenical movement to maintain, as New Delhi put it, that unity it both God's Will and His gift to the Church: that it must be made visible in each place and that the faithful in each place must be united with the whole Christian fellowship in all places and all ages. I hope that Uppsala will not merely confirm this insight, but develop its implications so clearly that all churches may be encouraged to make a much greater effort for the promotion of true unity.

4. Youth expects answers

We have not foreseen that this Assembly would meet in a year which seems to belong to the category of years of general and worldwide social and cultural crisis such as 1848, 1918 or 1945. And this time the crisis is above all a crisis in the relations between the generations.

It is difficult to understand a general crisis when we are in the midst of it. But it seems to me already clear that we can distinguish three levels in it.

There is first of all the obvious crisis in our system of education. Students demand with good reason to have a much larger share of responsibility in all decisions concerning the content and method of their education and concerning the structures of university life. But that is only part of the story. For it has become very clear that behind that

demand for reform of the educational system there is at a second deeper level a radical calling in question of the political and social regimes in all parts of the world. It is by no means clear just what kind of society the younger generation wants to create. And so the experienced politicians, the practical men of business and civil administration, and indeed most of the older generation in state and church with their fear of disorder tend to dismiss this challenge as utterly unrealistic and dangerously subversive. But it seems to me that this is a most short-sighted attitude. However vague the aspirations of this new generation may be, whatever excessive, self-defeating or intolerable forms their protest may sometimes assume, the questions they raise are real questions. Youth rightly expects answers.

And this brings us to the third level. Behind it all there lies the issue of the total orientation of our civilisation. Youth performs its historical mission of confronting us brutally with the question of the meaning of our common life. Can man live meaningfully in a great society in which production and consumption have become automatic forces and in which the astounding possibilities of technology are not brought under the control of a clear common purpose, a purpose which has to do with man as a person rather than man as a producer and consumer?

When young people all over the world ask searching questions about the ultimate meaning of life — the churches should prick up their ears. *Nostra res agitur*. If we have anything to say about the orientation of our life together, about the

calling of men, about a truly responsible society, about the true priorities, this is the time to say it and to say it in such a clear, simple and direct way that youth also may prick up their ears.

We did not plan that this Assembly on the God-given renewal of all things should be held in the very year of explosive demands for radical renewal of society. But now that without our doing, but not without higher guidance, we are in that unprecedented situation, we are bound to make clear that He who will make all things new at the end of time, has a word of hope and direction for all those who look for renewal in the present. For "the spiritual energies of the age to come" of which the Epistle to the Hebrews speaks (Hebr. 6:5) are already at work in the present age.

Christian Reformed Church Issues Statement on Race

(Grand Rapids) Meeting here in annual Synod, the Christian Reformed Church was prompted by its Board of Home Missions to seek to eliminate racism from church and society. The Synod also called for a day of prayer for a renewal of society and declared that the churches ought freely to receive as brethren regardless of race or colour all who repent of their sins and profess faith in Jesus Christ.

The Synod prefaced its declarations by stating: "Desiring that men of every race may live together in obedience to the Word of God the Christian Reformed Church presents this testimony concerning the teaching of the Word with the earnest prayer that by the power of the Spirit there may be the renewal of society according to His will".

The Synod requested its Board of Home Missions "to design, organize, and implement programs through which

the denomination, individual churches, and members can effectively use all available resources to eliminate racism, both causes and effects, within the body of believers and throughout the world in which we live.

The decision to call for a day of special prayer for renewal was requested by a Chicago congregation which has taken a firm stand against racism. In calling for the observance, the Synod set July 14 as a "day of prayer in which the members of the Christian Reformed Church will give themselves to repentance and to public and private prayer that Almighty God in His matchless love will bring about a renewal of our society by means of the faithful proclamation and application of the gospel of His saving and reconciling love, and that men of different races may be cleansed of their sinful antagonisms through the atoning blood of Jesus Christ and live

together in the fellowship of love under the discipline of His lordship".

In a strongly worded statement, the Synod declared that "members of the Christian Reformed Church ought freely to receive as brethren, regardless of race or colour, all who repent of their sins and profess faith in Jesus Christ as Saviour and Lord; that exclusion from full Christian fellowship on account of race or colour is sinful; and that if members are judged responsible for such exclusion they must be dealt with according to the provisions of the Church Order regarding Admonition and Discipline".

The Synod made it clear that fear of persecution or of disadvantage to self or to institutions arising out of obedience to Christ does not warrant denial to anyone for reasons of race or colour of full Christian fellowship and privilege in the church or in related organizations. (RES NE 6/25/68)

*Factors Peculiar to Africans in South Africa which lead to the Disruption of Family Life**

— Mrs. Sheena Duncan

I have been asked to speak tonight on the factors peculiar to Africans in South Africa which lead to the disruption of marriages and family life. I would ask you to bear in mind that all the factors which place strains on marriages all over the world place the same strains on African families here. They, too, have to be strong to contend with changing social patterns, with the struggle for the recognition of the individual's identity in a world dominated by impersonal power, with the loss of the extended family unit and the loss of the small community. All the problems met with in counselling marriage partners all over the world occur in South Africa among all racial groups.

But here, in addition to all these serious and disrupting factors, we, the white electorate and government of this country, are responsible for the creation of a multitude of laws and regulations which make it impossible for many African couples to fulfill the duties and responsibilities imposed by the Christian sacrament of marriage, let alone to enjoy the benefits of ever "remaining in perfect love and peace together". This, a Christian country, actually legislates to separate a husband from his wife, a father from his children, for all but a few weeks in the year. Many men have to make the choice, which is no choice at all, between earning money to feed their families and remaining with them in their common home.

MIGRATORY LABOUR

Much has been written and much said about the necessity for and the undesirability of a migratory labour system. In South Africa we are not only accepting it as a one-time necessary but temporary evil in a country where rich industrial areas are separated by great distances from over-populated poor ones; we are extending, encouraging and perpetuating it. We are basing all our future economic and social planning on migrant labour.

In 1966 85% of the wage earners of the Transkei were employed outside of it; 278,000 migratory workers from the Transkei alone — 278,000 people from the Transkei alone who were separated from their families — 278,000 fathers, mothers, husbands or sons who had to move far afield to earn enough to help feed their families. The migrants leave their families and

homes on a contract which lasts for a year. They go to the cities where they live in so-called "bachelor" or single quarters returning home when their contract expires for a few weeks, maybe for a few months if they can afford it, or if they cannot immediately be placed in a new job, until a new contract is attested and they must leave again. This is the pattern of the whole of their working lives. Under the new regulations for Labour Bureaux at Bantu Authorities which came into force on the first of May this year every man between the ages of 15 and 65 who is dependent on employment for his livelihood and who lives in the area of a tribal labour office must register as a workseeker.

The labour tenant system on farms is being abolished. Those African families who used to live together on white farms where the breadwinner perhaps worked for the farmer while living with his wife and children will no longer be able to do so. Farm labour must also now be on the migrant system. His family may no longer live with the labourer at his place of work but is resettled in villages in the homelands, again to be united temporarily only at the termination of a contract. Even in those areas designated as border industrial areas many of the workers employed cannot live at home because the distance from the border areas to their homes is too great for more than occasional weekend visits. These migrants have no alternative but to accept work offered to them in distant places. It is generally accepted that the "homelands" cannot possibly ever support their own populations even if the population were to remain static at the present level.

It is the stated end of this government that all Africans working in white areas shall be there for purposes of labour only, as migrant workers with no roots or ties at their places of work. I leave it to you to imagine the almost insuperable difficulties to be surmounted if a vital, stable marriage is to be built when a husband and wife can only live together for a few weeks every year throughout a man's working life, a situation which is greatly aggravated if the couple are too poorly educated to express themselves in letters and too poor to snatch long weekends or brief holidays together during the year, and when the environments of each differ so greatly that common interests are extremely limited. How many of us can be confident that our marriages could withstand such strains as these?

"CANCER"

To quote from the report on migratory labour of the Cape Synod of the Dutch Reformed Church — "The disadvantages of the system can be summarised as the complete break-up of family life, a religious and social problem of the greatest moment. Under the conditions of migratory labour it is absolutely impossible to build a stable social life and a peaceful and happy community. . . . The Church must point out the moral implications and the frightening results of the system, and emphasise that a cancer which so rages in the lives of the African population must necessarily affect the whole social and religious life of all the population groups in our Fatherland".

Now we must look at the situation in the towns and cities. There are thousands of Africans who, by virtue of birth in an urban area or long continuous residence there, have acquired the right to live and work in a town: this, of course, means one town only. A man with right in Johannesburg has none in any other city, indeed none in Bryanston or Northcliff. Although his lot is incom-

parably better than that of the contract worker it represents what to a white man would be intolerable insecurity. His right to live in a city is dependent, among other things, on his continuing to be in regular employment and on never taking an offer of a job in a neighbouring prescribed area. But the right to live and work in one particular town does not give him the right to have his wife living with him. She must also qualify to live in the same prescribed area. Only if they both have rights as individuals may they apply to be placed on a waiting list for a house where they can establish a home and family. There are many men who live permanently in a town whose wives are hundreds of miles away in a resettlement village or with relatives in a homeland. Frequently these men take a town wife especially if they married the first woman by Bantu Customary Union which does not legally prevent them from marrying another. The family in the country is then, to all intents and purposes, deserted. There are many more men whose wives cannot establish the right to live with their husbands and who live illegally with them in backyards or in a room in someone else's house. Could any of us stand the constant fear and insecurity this entails, fear of being found out, arrested, and fined or goaled? Could any of us live with the tension this way of life creates without taking it out on the person nearest to us? If your wife is late home is your first thought one of fear that she is in the hands of the police? The tragic results of this sort of insecurity for the future maturity of the children are being reaped now and can only worsen in the future.

479,114 people were prosecuted during the year ending 30th June, 1966, for infringement of influx control regulations — that is approximately 1,313 every day. In the Witwatersrand area alone in the first six months of 1966, 38,391 people were arrested for non-possession of identity documents or for being in the area for more than 72 hours without permission. 49,496 people were endorsed out of the Witwatersrand. According to Hansard of the 27th February, 1968, 203,500 Africans from the white urban areas have been settled in centres in the homelands.

INTOLERABLE

The whole social climate in the urban African towns is one of extreme tension and insecurity. Any society where there are thousands of men living apart from their wives in "bachelor" quarters; where there are thousands of people dodging the police as a permanent way of life for fear of arrest for technical offences; where children are brought up to be hidden and to fear the law, cannot provide the climate for stable marriages nor can the family unit be secure enough to stabilise the society.

An African man, living and working legally in Johannesburg who marries a woman who does not qualify in her own right to be in Johannesburg may not bring her to live with him. She would have to prove that she entered the area lawfully and ordinarily resides with her husband. As she cannot now enter Johannesburg lawfully this condition is impossible of fulfilment. Even if he can afford the fare necessary to bring her to Johannesburg on regular visits she may not enter the city for more than 72 hours without obtaining a visitor's permit. It is intolerable that we should demand of any woman that she should get a permit to stay with her husband for a short visit and that we should make it impossible for her to live with him at all on a permanent basis. It is intolerable that a man's wife can be arrested and removed from his house for no other reason than that, through circumstances of birth and employment, she lacks the necessary papers and proofs to be there at all. It is intolerable that an African man should sit across the desk from me and say "Do you mean that they can come into my house and arrest my wife and take her away from me", and that I should have to answer "yes".

All these factors lead to tremendous marriage problems which no counselling can alleviate or solve. There was the couple who asked how they could be married and how they could live together. He was born in Witbank but came to Johannesburg as a contract worker thus losing his right to live in Witbank. He met and fell in love with a woman who was born in Parys and came to work illegally in Johannesburg thus losing her rights to live anywhere at all. They wished to marry. One

Bantu Commissioner refused to marry them because neither belonged in his area but the problem of actually getting married is nothing compared to the fact that neither of them has any place in their own country and that the only way they could live together would be to get themselves resettled in a homeland where they could not afford to live together because there is no work.

Then there is an elderly man who was born in Johannesburg but did not know that he should remain here and accepted work outside. He is now retired and wishes to live with his wife who lives legally in Soweto. He has been endorsed out of Johannesburg and is appealing against this official decision. It is intolerable that he should need to plead for permission to live with his wife.

A couple asked for help who have been living together for years and have four children but the woman is illegally here and has been arrested so many times and the man has paid so many fines for her that he wished to marry her as he mistakenly thought this would give her the right to live with him. He came to ask how they could get married because he was too frightened to go to his local minister as he feared his wife would be arrested once more when the necessary particulars were taken. He can marry this woman but is condemned to establishing her and the children in a place where they cannot live together because he must work for their support, or to continue to keep her with him and continue to pay her fines. It is intolerable that this should be the choice which white South Africa confronts him with.

Many marriages are broken by divorce as a direct result of the pass laws. However devoted a couple may be, however determined to build a successful marriage, the strain placed upon them frequently leads to a complete break-up. A woman who cannot get her papers in order eventually comes to feel guilt at the trouble she is bringing upon her husband. He, after months, sometimes years, of waiting in queues for official decisions vital to him, after having to take days off work to join these queues and having to bear the brunt of his employer's disapproval, possibly losing jobs because of it, grows resentful, loses heart and decides that all that remains is to rid himself of her and her problems and

either to try again or to confine himself to casual, temporary unions with no responsibilities attached to them. If a man wishes to get rid of his wife for any reason he can get her name removed from his housing permit and bring another woman into the house. If the wife wishes to get a house for herself and her children she must obtain a divorce first. This leads to great insecurity on the part of the wife and makes her dependent on her husband's goodwill to an extent that can be a material factor in the marital disputes that arise in any marriage.

CHILDREN

The other members of a family unit face these difficulties and others. We have seen that thousands of African children are brought up in homeland areas without really getting a chance to know their fathers but they are fortunate compared to thousands of others in the urban areas. Here parents are faced with enormous problems. The fortunate families are those where both parents qualify to live in the same place and who manage to keep their children at home and to educate them at local schools. Many parents, however, decide for a variety of reasons that the children would be better sent to grandparents or other relatives in the country for a few years. Conditions in the urban towns are not ideal for the bringing up of children if both parents have to be away at work all day. Many schools are working with double sessions and there are not enough nurseries, creches and play centres. Parents do not like to think of their children in the streets with no supervision out of school hours so they send them away. But they do not realise that by doing this their children lose their rights in the urban area concerned and are now only allowed to return to their parents until they are eighteen if they are sons. On reaching this age these boys are endorsed out of the town and away from their parents. Very often by this time the grandparent in the country has died and there is literally no one for them to go to. Daughters may remain in their father's house (if he is a qualified man) as long as they are unmarried, but when they marry they are very often endorsed out whether their husbands are qualified men or not. Children may go away from the towns without pre-

judicing their position for purposes of schooling only, and must be able to prove that they have gone for this purpose and that they were registered scholars during the time that they were away. You probably know that government policy is that all new secondary schools must be established in the "homelands". This means that many parents who would prefer their children to remain at home cannot get places for them in local schools and have to send them away.

Thousands of other children are born to mothers living illegally in an urban area. These children grow up belonging nowhere and when they reach an age to earn their own living they find that they cannot remain in the towns but are endorsed out and often resettled by the authorities because they literally have nowhere to go. These children can never prove that they belong in the town where they were born and have lived because their mothers, being illegally there, cannot have their own or their children's names on a housing permit. These children are also often deprived of education as they may not now be admitted to a school without proof of legal residence.

The extended family, too, often suffers under the regulations. Adult sons and daughters living in an urban area may not have an aged parent living in their care unless that parent already legally belongs in the area. The same thing applies if a man wishes to care for any relative who needs a home for any reason, perhaps because of a physical disability or mental retardation.

Apart from the strain put on marriages by the physical enforced separations which we have discussed, the processes of officialdom and the fear of the law, there are many other factors which affect the stability of family and community amongst Africans. These are not peculiar to this country but are conditions which are greatly aggravated by the pass laws.

There is grinding poverty — 68% of families in Soweto have incomes below the estimated living costs.

There is a fantastic crime rate — In the Johannesburg municipal area during the year 1st March, 1966, to 28th February, 1967, there were 891 cases of murder; 1,156 cases of rape; 7,747 of assault with intent to do grievous bodily harm; 8,075 of common assault and 33,489 cases of theft.

But above all is the insecurity which is something every African has to grow up with and live with all his life through. Everything for him depends on having the correct stamps in his reference book and in the reference books of his family. He has to tread warily through a maze of restrictions and compulsions which make up his daily life. Should he manage to comply with the law he still has to contend with the difficulties inherent in trying to maintain a stable family unit in the midst of an extremely unstable environment.

CHRISTIAN RESPONSIBILITY

This is our responsibility. We must bear the guilt of this situation. The Church clearly states that Holy Matrimony is an honourable estate, instituted by God himself signifying the mystical union that is betwixt Christ and His Church. We make it impossible for parents to bring up their children in the "fear and nurture of the Lord". We make it difficult that "the natural instincts and affections implanted by God, should be hallowed and directed aright". We forcibly prevent the "mutual society, help and comfort that the one ought to have of the other".

What is the Church going to do about it? What are we going to do about it? First and foremost I suggest that it is our duty to refuse our consent to what is done in our name. It is not enough to say that we do not approve; we must protest and protest again. We must fight all the way until we have achieved a truly Christian and just society for all our people. Christian resignation and the patient bearing of suffering for Christ's sake is our Christian duty but was never intended to mean that we should expect others to patiently bear avoidable suffering inflicted by ourselves whether deliberately or through our omissions and failures.

Many people, probably many of you here, will say that it is all very well to talk of the evils of influx control but that it is necessary and what are we to have in its place? But I say that any system which is so absolutely wrong, both in its conception of racial superiority and the separation of people one from the other, and in its result in the toll of sorrow and tragedy cannot be allowed to continue. Of course the bringing about of freedom of movement for all South Africans will bring its own problems but, because the results of

the present system cannot be justified in any way at all, we must spend the thought, energy and money we now lay waste in enforcing the apartheid laws on constructive action towards a better way of life.

Secondly we must make ourselves and those we come into contact with aware of the facts. The facts are readily available to those who wish to study them. There have been dozens of conferences, papers, reports, committees and articles on the evil effects of migratory labour and influx control on the lives of the African people but it is a dismal fact that the majority of the people in Church pews on Sunday mornings and the majority of the clergy are abysmally unaware. I think perhaps we do really know but, because that knowledge insists that we act, we shut off awareness until it is forced on us when we suddenly find that we cannot register a servant, or have to go to some trouble to get a man out of goal when he has been arrested for standing on the pavement without his reference book.

Thirdly it is our duty to become involved in the lives of others. One of the recommendations made in the

report of the Committee on Social Responsibility of the Diocese of Cape Town reads: "There is a tremendous need for all Christians to take up the problems of Africans with whom they come into contact and so become involved in their family difficulties, thereby learning at first hand their fears and frustrations and sharing their troubles and endeavouring to solve them. It is the duty of the Church to encourage her members to do this".

The Church, with its far flung outposts, can help enormously by offering assistance to people who find themselves arriving in a strange place because they have been endorsed out of a familiar one. The Church in towns and cities can help by making it known that people in trouble of this sort can turn to the Church for help. All Christians can help by a readiness to make representations, to explore all avenues on behalf of someone in need.

This third point brings us back to the first. The more we become involved, the more we try to help individuals, then the more we realise that whatever we can do, however

hard we try we can only scratch the surface of a great need. To achieve any lasting results we must strike at the roots of the system itself. Protest, representation, dissent and denial and teaching are the ways open to us. The Church has great influence. We have been given the grace to achieve great things.

There is always the argument that the Church should keep out of politics but politics is an integral part of life and society and as such is very much the concern of Christians. We cannot opt out of matters which vitally affect the lives of people; we cannot take water and wash our hands of this responsibility.

* *The text of an address given at a symposium held in Johannesburg during "Family Week", under the auspices of the Section of Home and Family Life of the Witwatersrand Christian Council. Mrs. Sheena Duncan is a trained Marriage Guidance Counsellor and experienced in urban African problems.*

Die Kerk Buite Suid-Afrika

— Prof. B. B. Keet

UPPSALA

Dr. Herman Ridderbos (by ons geen onbekende nie) wat meermale sy erkentlikheid laat blyk het vir die gulle ontvangs wat hy van ons kerkmense ontvang het, en waardering uitgespreek het vir veel goeds wat aan die gekleurde rasse in Suid-Afrika bewys word, hoewel hy nooit die apartheidsbeleid goedgekeur het nie, skryf 'n baie belangrike artikel oor die vergadering van die Wêreldraad van Kerke te Uppsala in „Gereformeerde Weekblad” van 14 Junie. Onder andere sê hy dat die vergadering van die Wêreldraad van Kerke groot belangstelling in die pers, radio en televisie verkry, 'n belangstelling wat kenmerkend is van veranderde kerklike besef. Sonder dat die organisatoriese eenheid van die kerke oor die wêreld heen blykbaar soveel meer kans kry om verwesenlik te word,

kom Christene al meer tot die ontdekking dat hulle saam met ander kerke bestaan en beleef hulle lidmaatskap nie uitsluitend as gebondenheid aan eie kerk nie. Met die oog op die verskillende kerkgroeperinge bly aan hierdie kerklike besef nog iets onbepaalds kleef. Maar die eenheid in die veelheid, ook al kan daar geen volle uitdrukking aan gegee word nie, laat hom tog met krag geld en op groter skaal belewe om kerk te wees, daar hulle dié eenheid wil toets aan bybelse maatstawwe.

Intussen kan nie beweer word dat die Wêreldraad in sy strewe na eenheid van die kerke, alle ander eienskappe en maatstawwe van die kerk van minder belang beskou nie. Baie van die konferensies, studie-rapporte ens. word altyd weer gewy aan vrae van die geloof en die kerkorde, m.a.w. aan die maatstawwe van die inhoudelike en organisatoriese eenheid van

die kerk. 'n Mens kan nie beweer dat in hierdie opsig groot vorderinge gemaak is nie. Selfs kan betoog word dat die verskynsel van die kerk nie alleen in organisasie nie, maar ook in die leer meer aandag kry, en dat sommige selfs in die Bybel probeer die grondslag vind. Ook die Nuwe Testament self sou reeds allerlei leertipes vertoon wat dit moontlik sou maak dat elke kerkformasie hom vir sy eie „spesialiteit” met 'n seker reg teenoor die ander op die Skrif kan beroep.

Daarby kom nog dat ook in die teologiese diskussies van die Wêreldraad die vraag na die hermeneutiek (teorie van Skrifverklaring) 'n steeds groter rol speel. Ons het, so word gesê, 'n lang tyd wel gemeen dat ons in die Bybel 'n gemeenskaplike bron en maatstaf besit en dat namate die kerke hulle meer aan die getuïenis van die Skrif hou, hulle ook vanself

meer eenheid sou vertoon. Maar altyd weer kom die vraag aan die orde: hoe lê 'n mens die Bybel uit, nie alleen suiwer-eksegeties nie, maar veral prakties, só dat hy in die gedagte-wêreld van die moderne mens 'n plek kan kry, só dat hy in die moderne tyd verstaan kan word? Steeds meer blyk daaruit dat wat vroeër as bybelkritiek gekwalifiseer is, tans 'n veel positiewer rol wil speel, nl. as middel om die eintlike bybelse boodskap uit die bewussyn van die vroeër skrywers en lesers van die Bybel oor te bring in die bewussyn van die teenswoordige mens. Hierdie hermeneutiese probleem is tans ook in die teologiese diskussies van die Wêreldraad aan die orde en dit blyk nie of hulle spoedig tot ooreenstemming sal kom nie.

Dit alles kan nie erg optimisties klink nie en die indruk gee dat dit 'n geweldige praat-kollege is. Hoewel daar stellig veel gepraat word, sou dit 'n onjuiste en onbillike kwalifikasie wees. Want vireers lê daar iets uitermate gesonds in dat kerke van verskillende historiese, geografiese en teologiese agtergronde nie alleen met mekaar praat nie, maar hulle ook aan mekaar toets en saam aan die Skrif probeer toets. Daar is uiteraard die gevaar van allerlei kerkbederf nie uitgesluit nie. Maar aan die ander kant is dit nie minder waar nie, dat allerlei teologiese eensydighede en

vervalsinge van die bybelse boodskap en sy strekking in die groot kring van kerke minder kans kry om 'n dominerende rol te speel as in een klein kring. Daarom word die voortgaande gesprek oor die geloof en die orde in die kerk nie as grensloos beskou nie, maar eerder as 'n nodige en nuttige gemeenskaplike konfrontasie van die kerke met wat telkens nuwe probleme, nuwe uitsigte en nuwe bedreigings vir die kerk in die teenwoordige tyd voortbring. Daar word weliswaar geen beslissing vir elke kerk gemaak nie. Want die Wêreldraad besit nie so 'n bevoegdheid nie. Maar dit beteken nie dat ons dus ons aan dit alles hoef te onttrek of nie daaraan hoef deel te neem nie. Die teendeel is eerder waar, wanneer ons erken dat buite die eie kerk ook elders geworstel word met die waarheid van die Skrif en om die leiding van die Gees van God.

Tog sou ons aan die ander kant 'n verkeerde voorstelling van die Wêreldraad maak, as ons dink dat alleen die vraag na die eenheid van die kerke aan die orde is. Dit is eerder so dat die aandag van die vergaderde kerke altyd weer gevestig word op die vraag wat die kerk in die sosiale en politieke verhoudings van hierdie tyd is. Ongetwyfeld lê hier vir die bestaan van die Wêreldraad bepaalde gevare, omdat kerke van

verskillende politieke struktuur deelneem aan die besprekinge en hierdie besprekinge van nasionale en politieke tendense sal 'n gewigtige woord meesprek. Ook bly die Wêreldraad 'n vergadering van kerke, d.w.s. hy het geen uitvoerende bevoegdhede op politieke en sosiale gebied nie en kan maklik sy doel mis. Maar in die samelewing van die volkere en die vrac van oorlog en vrede en sosiale verhoudings verrig dit 'n baie belangrike taak, en probeer om weë en insigte te open vir die toekoms. Gevaar vir veel verwarring is hier seker nie denkbeeldig nie. Andersyds: wanneer die Woord van God 'n krag tot behoud is van die hele lewe, hoe sou kerke wat uit alle streke van die aarde saamkom, hulle nie oor die menigvuldige ellendes en node van die teenswoordige mensheid kan bekommer nie?

Gereformeerdes soos prof. Berkouwer, ds. R. Bakker en prof. Verkuyl het die konferensie bygewoon, op persoonlike uitnodiging (soos prof. Berkouwer) of as verteenwoordigers van sendingkorporasies. Hoewel die Gereformeerde Kerke nie lid is nie, staan hulle nie opsy sonder belangstelling nie. En dit kan ook van baie lede gesê word, dat hulle met groot belangstelling die verloop en uitkoms van hierdie groot kerklike vergadering sou volg.

Prophetic Christianity in the Congo

— DR. MARIE-LOUISE MARTIN

1 Origin and History of the Kimbanguist Church

Introductory note Together with a Swiss colleague I enjoyed the great privilege of being sent for a period of 3 months — interrupted by a brief spell in Switzerland to present our reports — to the Congo (Kinshasa and Brazzaville) to study the history and life of the "Eglise de Jesus Christ sur la terre par le prophète Simon Kimbangu" (Church of Jesus Christ on earth through the prophet Simon Kimbangu). This church has applied for membership to the World Council of Churches. The Moravian Church of the European Continent, being especially interested in the Kimbanguist Church (as we shall call

it in these articles), sponsored our mission and fact-finding tour. Apart from a few articles in "Practical Anthropology" by J. E. Bertsche (Vol. 13, No 1); in the Ecumenical Review, Vol XIX, No. 1; in Zaïre by P. Raymaekers, Vol. XIII, No. 7 and in the "Cahiers de la Reconciliation", by J. Lasserre and F. Chofat, June 1966, very little of real value has been published on S. Kimbangu and the church that originated from his activity and witness. The voluminous monography written by E. Andersson on Messianic popular movements in the Lower Congo, (Uppsala, 1958) does not distinguish

clearly between true Kimbanguism and the many messianic and syncretistic movements which sprang up after Kimbangu's imprisonment. These latter movements use the name of Simon Kimbangu, but are very different in life and teaching from true Kimbanguism. The articles written by the Rev. van Wing reveal his hostile attitude towards Kimbanguism and stem from information gathered from people outside the movement. When we were given our mission, the spiritual head of Kimbanguism made it a condition that we came "pour vivre le Kimbanguisme" (to live within the movement) and not to

observe it from the outside only. I believe that this was the only valid method to learn to know the movement and to appreciate its true value.

1. Who was Simon Kimbangu

He was a Mukongo, born in 1889 at NKamba in the Congo Central, in a territory that had been attributed by the Belgian colonial administration to the English Baptist Mission (BMS). Simon is the name that was given to him when he was baptized, whereas Kimbangu is his traditional Kikongo name and means "he who reveals what is concealed". His parents died when Simon was still a child, and he was brought up by his grandmother, named Kinzembo. Kinzembo, who was deported in 1927 to Boma and died there, had been a woman of great courage. When the missionary Cameron of Gombe-Lutete, some miles from NKamba, was one day pursued by people of a village who intended to kill him, she hid him in her hut and swept dust from the courtyard lest any traces of the fugitive be seen. Before leaving Kinzembo, the missionary Cameron blessed her, and this blessing became palpable in the person of her grandchild Simon Kimbangu.

Simon attended a protestant primary school for four years and later married Mwilu Marie in the Baptist Church. He was a peasant and for some time worked as a catechist at the mission. He was a faithful Christian, a humble and modest man, as his sons repeatedly told us.

2. Simon Kimbangu's call

One night, in 1918, during the terrible flu-epidemic which killed thousands in the Congo who were without any medical help, Simon heard a voice that said to him: "I am Christ, my servants are unfaithful. I have chosen you to witness to your brethren and to convert them." Simon Kimbangu replied that he was not educated, that there were pastors and deacons who could do this work better. Every night, however, Simon Kimbangu heard the voice that called him, but he was too shy to accept the call. Finally, to escape it, he fled to Kinshasa (then Leopoldville). But even there the voice of Christ reached him, while he was hiring himself out as a labourer. When he did not receive

his wages for 3 months, he was forced to return to his native villiage where he continued to work in the fields. On the morning of 6th April, 1921 when going to the market, he felt constrained, against his own will, to enter the house of a woman Nkiantonde. As she was in agony he laid his hands upon her in the name of Jesus Christ. The woman got up and was healed, but accused Simon Kimbangu saying that he had previously bewitched her and had now come to remove the curse from her. Against his will, he performed other miracles. One of these was a dramatic raising of a child who was unwanted by her mother, but whose father insistently prayed for the life of the child. People were at first afraid of Simon and got out of his way; some even thought that he was a magician. But Simon, with the Bible in his hand, invariably replied that it was Christ who accomplished these miracles through him. He denied having any power of his own. Suddenly the tide turned and people from all over flocked to NKamba, Simon Kimbangu's home. They left their forced labour, their fields, their white masters, their kitchens and went to NKamba to hear the African prophet whom God had raised and through whom the story of the Gospels suddenly became a reality for them. Until then it had been for many African Christians simply a tale that they had heard from the white man. But now, through the activity of Simon, Christ had become "existential", he had become real for them. They re-lived salvation-history. Simon Kimbangu healed and preached the gospel of repentance and forgiveness to his brethren without accepting any remuneration. It was the true gospel, in simple form, centred upon Christ the Saviour who was crucified for men and victoriously rose from the dead. NKamba became the place of a real evangelical revival which had wide repercussions. The Kimbanguists speak of this period as the NKamba-Pentecost. The holy Spirit had been poured out on Simon in abundance, and this is why at the end of the trinitarian formula many Kimbanguists add: "... the Holy Spirit who spoke to us through the prophet Simon Kimbangu", or "who acted through the prophet Simon Kimbangu". Sometimes the term "incarnation of the Spirit in Simon Kimbangu" is used, as I was told in a discussion which

I had with some Kimbanguist brethren after they had asked me to preach the Pentecost sermon in their new big church at Matete, a suburb of Kinshasa. Such terms, however, must not be misinterpreted, as I discovered when discussing the meaning of this term with them. They *live* their faith, and our dogmatic and systematic formulations and terms are foreign to them and therefore have very often a different meaning from what theologians coming from western traditions (even African pastors!) understand by them.

NKamba became the new Jerusalem, and in years to come will be a place for prayer and spiritual retreats only.

Blind people who came to Simon were sent to wash in a source just down the hillside from NKamba and many regained their sight. Subsequently the source of NKamba, blessed by Simon Kimbangu, took on great importance in the life of the movement. After Simon Kimbangu's arrest, people went to bathe in the source — and still do so today — while they pray for healing or any spiritual need they have. But there was — and still is — no magic attached to this water. Healing and salvation depend entirely on prayer and faith, and not on the water. There is a great difference between the purification-ceremonies of Zionist churches in Southern Africa that take place in rivers, and the quiet, sober ceremony of bathing in the source which today is widened to a pool. Here individuals go alone, while a group of elders pray for them on the hillside. They then immerse themselves in the name of the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit.

3. Persecution and arrest

Simon Kimbangu's influence soon reached beyond the boundaries within which the Roman Catholic Missions tolerated the influence of protestant missions. Hence Roman Catholic missionaries informed the government of the danger of a popular revolt in the Bas-Congo. The masters whose servants had left their work also complained to the colonial administration, especially those responsible for forced labour. Protestant missionaries too, though not altogether hostile, began to distrust Simon as they were unable to take the responsibility for a movement over which they had lost control, and

yet, for which they were accused by their Roman counterparts of assisting its origination. Their situation was precarious. Even from beyond the Congo-river, from Boko (now the administrative seat of the Kimbanguist Church of the Congo-Brazzaville) people came to Simon Kimbangu, and it was at Boko where the early missionaries tried to incorporate the movement as an element of revival into their church, at least at the beginning.

The Belgian administration sent men to investigate the movement. Simon Kimbangu was falsely accused of having caused disorder because workshops, kitchens and churches emptied while people undertook a pilgrimage to the prophet at NKamba. He was charged with xenophobia — though he had predicted that people from all the four corners of the earth would come and worship Christ with his disciples. He was unjustly accused of inciting people to stop paying taxes. All these accusations can be found in documents of the Belgian colonial administration. The prophet was to be arrested, but escaped, together with 5 helpers (Bansalisi) and 12 apostles of whom not all remained faithful in times of persecution and suffering. Some of the first witnesses and helpers are still alive and active. Among them is Mrs. Mandombe Mikala, who gave me a good amount of information about the beginnings of the movement. These Bansalisi received power from the prophet to lay on hands to heal the sick, but apart from them only the prophet (and today his sons) are allowed to do this. Simon and his disciples spent weeks out in the bush, under most difficult conditions, sleeping in the open veld, often deprived of food. He taught them and then returned to Nkamba to be arrested. This happened on 24th September, 1921, only six months after his first healing. We have seen the place where he went to surrender himself, together with his disciples. He commanded his followers not to resist arrest and not to return evil for evil — hence the movement took on a non-violent character from the outset. The soldiers who arrested Simon and his followers treated them in a brutal way, and took them chained without food or water to Nzundu and from there to Thysville. According to Mrs. Mikala there was one unfortunate incident: an African servant of a Belgian soldier became

angry when he witnessed the brutality of the arrest and wanted to avenge the prophet and his disciples. As a consequence the soldiers made use of their guns and a child was killed.

Simon Kimbangu's wife and his three sons, Charles Kisolokele, then six years old; Solomon Dialungana, then 4 years old, and the present spiritual head of the Church, Joseph Diangienda, then 2 years old, were also arrested and taken to Thysville. A court martial condemned Simon to 120 lashes and to death. There was no legal counsel, no witnesses. The whole trial was, as Jules Chomé, a Belgian lawyer, clearly proved in his book "La passion de Simon Kimbangu (Présence Africaine, 1959) a parody of justice. However, the death sentence was commuted by King Albert to life imprisonment. Kimbangu was deported to Lubumbashi (then Elizabethville) in the Katanga, thousands of miles away from his home, and died 30 years later on 12th October, 1951 in the prison hospital. All along his conduct had been exemplary and he was a real "martyr" of Christ. In 1935 the prison authorities and the governor of Katanga had recommended his release from prison, but it was turned down, allegedly on the advice of the Roman Catholic archbishop who feared that the Kimbanguist heresy would be encouraged through such clemency. Most of the time Simon Kimbangu was kept in solitary confinement and chained; his youngest son Joseph Diangienda found him thus in 1948. Only occasionally could he have contacts with his fellow-prisoners and work in the kitchen. A Belgian official who — fortunately for the church — took a photograph of Simon Kimbangu (the only one which we possess) was immediately dismissed and sent back to Belgium.

4. After Simon Kimbangu's arrest:

His wife Mwilu Marie, though supervised by the administration, continued to give spiritual support to the disciples of her husband. She prayed for the sick and sent them to the source at NKamba, which was controlled by soldiers. However, at night the Kimbanguists went there and sang their hymns — touching hymns of confidence in Christ — which are preserved, but for lack of funds not yet published. In the following years up to this day the

Kimbanguists developed this side of worship in a particular way.

Charles Kisolokele, the eldest son of Simon Kimbangu was separated from his family and interned in a Roman Catholic school at Boma where he was told that his family was dead and that he owed great thankfulness to the brothers of the school who had adopted him. This was, however, not true, as Charles Kisolokele found out two years later. He received nevertheless a very good education, and some years later was joined by his youngest brother Joseph Diangienda who got the same good schooling and was always first in his class.

NKamba was destroyed, and the inhabitants had to build a house for the military guard. They refused to be paid for their work, because "they did not want to sell NKamba to the Belgians". Up to 1925 a certain tolerance was exercised from time to time with the hope that the movement would die but between 1925 and 1957 the movement was severely persecuted with the definite aim of exterminating it. This lack of religious tolerance on the side of the Belgian colonial government is surprising as the country ought to have known after the experience of two world-wars what it was like to be dominated by a foreign power! 37,000 heads of families were deported from their home villiages and settled in almost uninhabitable regions of the Congo. This number corresponds to about 100,000 persons, relatively few of whom returned home after independence in 1960. This mass-deportation did however, weaken the movement but rather helped it to spread to all the provinces of the Congo. Thus the Church which emerged after the toleration of the Kimbanguists in 1957 and their recognition in December 1959, six months before independence, was not a tribal affair, as some ill-informed writers alleged, but an intertribal, even international church. It was intertribal and international because it had spread to the Congo-Brazzaville from the outset (where it was tolerated already in 1944), to Angola (where it is still persecuted by the Portuguese government), to neighbouring Rwanda, and also to Burundi, the Central African Republic, to Tshad, Zambia, Uganda and — if reports can be substantiated — to South West Africa. The blood of the martyrs had once again become the seed of the Church!

The deportees continued to sing their hymns, to pray and spread the Gospel and thus attracted a good many pagans. Meanwhile they attended formal worship in Catholic and Protestant Churches, especially the Salvation Army, which the Kimbanguists greeted in 1934 with enthusiasm. They believed that the "S" on their uniforms indicated that they were sent by Simon Kimbangu. At the beginning the Salvation Army became a real friend to the Kimbanguists but with a change of leadership this relationship also changed. Today there exists a tension between the Salvation Army and the Kimbanguists just as there are tensions between them and the Protestants and Catholics. The latter two still accuse the Kimbanguists of being a sect, of worshipping Kimbangu instead of Christ and of confusing the Holy Spirit with the person of Simon Kimbangu. We have seen a pamphlet in the Protestant bookshop entitled "Jesus Christ or Simon Kimbangu". Ecumenism has not yet really entered the Congo-Kinshasa and the Kimbanguists, though counting today probably between 3-5 million members and adherents, are still despised and looked down upon by many fellow-"Christians".

5. Tolerance and recognition.

Before his death Simon Kimbangu appointed his youngest son Joseph Diangienda, a charismatic leader of high intelligence, far-sighted, modern in outlook and equipped with all the qualities of leadership, as the head of the Church. This decision was the result of prayer because both Simon Kimbangu and Joseph Diangienda had thought that the eldest son Charles Kisilokele would be the leader. At that time Maman Mwilu Marie was still alive. She died in 1959, nine months before the church was recognized by the government.

Tolerance and recognition came about through a dramatic event. A number of Kimbanguists worked in the Belgian colonial administration. Among them were the eldest and the youngest sons of Simon Kimbangu, and the present General Secretary of the church, Mr. Lucien Luntadila, who had previously been a student at a Roman Catholic Seminary and had to leave it due to his Kimbanguist tendencies. Lucien, a brilliant young man, studying at

present in Europe, took part in the events which led to the edict of tolerance in 1957. He and T. Diangienda gave me a vivid account of them. The Magna Charta of human rights was discovered by one of the Kimbanguists. Here was a document to which Belgium subscribed when joining the U.N.O. Why then had Belgium not kept to the fundamental human right of religious freedom? The matter was taken up in Brussels by socialists. But this was not sufficient. In 1957 another six Kimbanguist pastors were to be deported. How could this fit in with human rights? Leading Kimbanguists, who for all these years had secretly come together for their worship while being nominally members of some other church, agreed to send a letter to the Governor General, Mr. Petillon to ask either to arrest them altogether (or even to kill them) or to tolerate their Church. Meanwhile the new name "Eglise de Jésus Christ sur la terre par le prophète Simon Kimbangu" had been introduced. The letter was signed by some hundreds of leading men in administrative or other privileged positions. The letter was taken by His Eminence, the spiritual head, Joseph Diangienda to the Governor General while the signatories stayed away from work to prepare for arrest or death. The Governor General did not know what to do. Could he grant tolerance? What would Brussels say? If not, could a mass-arrest not end in rebellion, not by Kimbanguists, but by other elements in the Congo who wanted their independence? The Kimbanguists themselves had promised that true to their principle they would not resist arrest or death. They all gathered in the Stadium Baudouin, then a sports-stadium. The Governor General tried to find a compromise, but Joseph Diangienda would not leave the place until he had received a definite reply; either yes (tolerance) or no (mass-arrest). Finally, after hesitation, the governor did the only right and reasonable thing: he granted tolerance, but it took two more years before the Church was given official recognition.

When this happened in December 1959, thousands of Kimbanguists left the churches to which they had hitherto nominally belonged, and once more Catholic, Protestant and Salvation Army churches emptied. The churches resented this arguing that the Kimbanguists have "taken away

from us 500, 1000, even 5,000 members". As if these people were the property of the churches and not rather of Jesus Christ! But losing so many members reflected badly in their statistics which had to be sent overseas to the mission-boards! And in the background loomed the question: An independent African Church, with African leadership, founded by Africans, with African traditions christianized, with a way of life that was thoroughly Christian and yet related to Africa as no church that issued from an oversea's mission or occidental church could achieve. Was this possible? Was this right?

The churches, with few exceptions, did a most deplorable thing: from day to day they dismissed from their schools children and students whose parents openly confessed to be Kimbanguists. Thus thousands of children were thrown out of their schools from day to day. Hence the young Kimbanguist Church without any financial means had to build up a gigantic educational system. They took up the challenge and created a school system that is admirable, but still lacks teachers in high schools.

In the same way Kimbanguists were no longer received in certain hospitals and dispensaries, because — contrary to South African Zionists — they never despised medical treatment despite their belief in divine healing. Why should God not make use of medicines for his work? Are they not, after all, God's gift? Yet everything depends on His will. Thus Kimbanguists had to create their own dispensaries with trained male or female nurses. As recently as 1963 Kimbanguists were refused admission to certain mission hospitals. When the spiritual head J. Diangienda had a serious car accident in 1963 and needed immediate medical aid, a certain hospital refused his admission on hearing that he was Simon Kimbangu's son!

(In our next issue Dr. Martin will give an account of the life, worship and organisation and theology of the Kimbanguist Church at present.)

Letters — Briewe

WAT SÊ DIE BYBEL?

Ds. Nico van Loggerenberg, Posbus 346, Benoni.

Ek is besonder bly dat mnr. J. A. Duigan op my skrywe van 'n tydjie gelede in Pro Veritate gereageer het, want dit bied my die geleentheid om die opregte bedoelinge van mnr. Duigan aan die Bybel, as onfeilbare en genoegsame Woord van God, te toets. Vooraf egter net twee opmerkinge.

Nee mnr. Duigan, ds. Van Loggerenberg is nie „weer kwaad” nie, hy spreek maar net sy opinie ondubbelsinnig en beslis uit. Hy het mos niks om oor kwaad te wees nie en daarby wil hy nie graag sondig deur sonder rede vir mnr. Duigan kwaad te wees nie. Hy het maar net beslis beswaar gemaak teen mnr. Duigan se „aanmatigende propaganda” omdat hy daarvan deeglik bewus is dat die Roomse Kerk, in sy volhardende afgodery, Jesus Christus in sy aardse sowel as in sy hemelse heerskappy verdring. Die hoog-kerklike glorie van die Pous vedring Christus op aarde en die mistiese verering van Maria verklein die alleenheerskappy van Christus in die hemel. Is dit nie genoeg rede om die Rooms-Katolisisme te bestry nie?

Verder wil ek graag opmerk: Nee mnr. Duigan, ds. Van Loggerenberg hou glad nie van „breedsprakigheid” nie, maar hy stel sy besware en feite in duidelike woorde. Hiervan hou mnr. Duigan hoegenaamd nie, daarom moet die lesers van Pro Veritate nou verneem van 'n „weer kwaad” wat nie bestaan nie. Ek mag seker die Rooms-Katolisisme bestry, want die verwronge kerkbegrip van Rome en die onverdedigbare kerkstaat-idee is in sy heidense grondmotief aan my bekend. Dit was mos Thomas van Aquino wat die Christendom en die heidendom vermeng het en sy dwaalbegrip is steeds die rigtinggewende in die Roomse teologie en staatsfilosofie. Hierdie feite kan mnr. Duigan beslis nie weerlê nie.

Ek is ook persoonlik dankbaar dat mnr. Duigan na II Petrus 1:20, Gal. 1:8 en 6:12 verwys, want dit is vir my die onfeilbare Woord van God en miskien kan hy nou die Bybelgronde vir onderstaande Roomse dogmas na vore bring.

1. Wat is die Bybel-bewyse vir die

Maria-aanbidding, die sogenaamde Maria-verering, van die Roomse Kerk? Waar het Jesus Christus of sy Apostels dit geleer?

2. Wat is die Bybel-bewyse vir die onfeilbaarheidsleer van die Pous? Waar het Jesus Christus of sy heilige Apostels dit ooit geleer of waar het Petrus dit vir homself toegeëien?
3. Wat is die Bybel-bewyse vir die voortgesette openbaringsleer van die Roomse Kerk wat die valse Roomse tradisie tot openbaringswoord verhef?
4. Wat is die Bybel-gronde vir die Roomse leer wat Maria tot Mede-Verlosseres verhoog en bonatuurlik vergoddelik?

Ons verlang bewyse uit die onfeilbare en genoegsame Woord van God en dan sal ons nie „weer kwaad” word nie, maar saam met mnr. Duigan getuig. Miskien moet Pro Veritate self ook let op bostaande vrae, voordat daar so maklik van „nuwere ontwikkeling in die Roomse Kerk” gepraat word. In bostaande dogmas is die onveranderbaarheid van die Roomse Kerk gegee en as die Kerke van die Reformasie toenadering tot Rome soek, dan beteken dit toenadering tot die Maria-aanbidding, die primaat van die Pous, die Roomse kerkbegrip en die valse Roomse tradisie wat die Woord van God, II Pet. 1:20, aanvul en ondergeskik maak.

THE BIBLE AND RACIAL DISCRIMINATION

Mr. V. J. Cooks, 38 Klein Street, Johannesburg.

I refer to the article in your May issue of Pro Veritate concerning „Die kerk van die Afrikaner” as voorspraak vir 'n politieke party-ideologie. I refute this unfounded allegation that segregation as practised here in South Africa between the white and black races is a man-invented ideology. Rather I uphold the Scriptural concept that it is an established God-decreed institution; and by inference attention is drawn thereto by the Lord Jesus Christ, as set out in Luke 17: 22-23, 24-30. In this connection it is stated in Malachi 4:5, “Behold, I will send you Elijah the prophet before the coming of the great and dreadful day of the Lord”; and then this prophecy is confirmed by Christ in Matthew 17:11. So we return to Luke 17:24, where Christ draws attention to the coming ministry of Elijah, the one like unto the Son of man (Dan. 7:13; Rev. 1:13, 14:14). And as it was in the days of Noah, so will it also be in the days of the one like unto the Son of man.

For in the days of Noah the descendants of Adam the Son of God (chap. 3:38) entertained the segregated descendants of Cain; they ate and drank, intermarried with the children of the reprobate Cain. As this state of affairs continued, despite the warnings sermonised by Noah, a preacher of righteousness (2 Peter 2:5), the Lord, the eternal Judge came and judged the Adamic civilisation for this wickedness. Likewise also in the days of Lot, they feasted; they bought and sold; they planted and reaped. But the same day Lot went out of Sodom, it rained fire and brimstone from heaven (the fulfilment of righteous judgment: Gen. 19:1, 13, 15-25), and destroyed them all. “Even thus will it be in that day when the one like unto the Son of man is revealed” (cf. Rev. 19:10).

No reasonable doubt can be advanced in an attempt to deny the revealed truth concerning the God-decreed segregation between the Adamic race (whites) and the Cainite race (blacks) nor is there any evidence in the Scripture that segregation has been revoked, whereby the so-called liberal (cf. Isa. 32:5-7, 8) can be furnished with grounds to present a plausible case outlawing segregation even in its modern attire and colloquially termed apartheid. But unfortunately for the integrationists and the enemies of segregation, the Scripture stands fast; the Word of God cannot be changed. Thus the irreverent ambitions of the apostates, the hypocritical liberals, and the atheists, cannot be accommodated, for their greatest ambition is to turn all the established and accepted things of life upside down and “to change times, and the long honoured laws”, thereby setting the servant over the children of God, because of their greater numbers. Hence we are continually being told that it is only our lack of faith that makes spectres out of integration between whites and blacks and the resultant practice of miscegenation (which truly degrades the white race and desecrates the body of Christ, making it an incongruous piebald; for these things the wrath of God shall descend upon all mankind for such wickedness). Therefore, let this truth be ever remembered that Christ, the Author and Finisher of ‘the faith’, stated warningly, that what transpired in Noah’s day and resulted in the destruction of the Adamic civilisation, shall be repeated in the days of Elijah. For he is destined to herald the coming of the glorified Man, even the Lord Jesus Christ in Person (cf. Zech. 14:3, 4, 7-9), whose coming shall not be in peace (Rev. 19:11-21).

(This letter has been shortened — Ed.)