



PRO VERITATE

BRUCKNER DE VILLIERS

Die Dooie God

CALVIN COOK

Improper Interference Bill

HANS HÄSELBARTH

Christian Resistance to the State

THOM KERSTIENS

"God's People on Man's Journey"

Volume VI, No. 10 | Jaargang VI, Nr. 10

February 15 Februarie

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

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

IN HIERDIE UITGAWE

- Dr. Bruckner de Villiers gee die „God is dood“-teoloë daarin gelyk dat dié God wat die mens vir hom na sy eie wense geskape het, inderdaad 'n dooie God is. Bl. 3
- Die Christelike Instituut het die geleentheid gehad om sy besware teen die „Wetsontwerp op die Verbod van Onbehoorlike Inmenging“ amptelik te gaan stel. In 'n kort artikel gee dr. Calvin Cook 'n samevatting van die standpunte wat voor die Regeringskommissie gestel is. Bl. 5
- Pastor H. Häselbarth bespreek die probleem van Christelike verzet teen die staat. Bl. 7
- Eerw. Theo Kotze vertel van die jeugklub „Route 12“ in die gemeente van die Metodiste Kerk te Seepunt. Bl. 10
- Die laaste gedeelte van Thom Kerstiens se inleidende lesing tot die Darde Wêreldkongres van die Leke-apostolaat in Rome (Okt. 1967) verskyn op Bl. 11
- Stephen Hayes, 'n Suid-Afrikaanse teologiese student wat op die oomblik in Engeland studeer, deel ons sy interessante indrukke mee van die vernuwings van die Rooms-Katolieke Kerk in Nederland. Bl. 14

IN THIS ISSUE . . .

- Dr. Bruckner de Villiers grants that the „God is dead“ theologians are right to the extent that that particular God who is a creation of man according to his own desires is indeed a dead God. P. 3
- The Christian Institute had the opportunity to state its objections officially against the „Improper Interference Bill“. In a short article Dr. Calvin Cook gives a summary of the viewpoints which were expressed before the Commission of the Government. P. 5
- Pastor H. Häselbarth discusses the problem of Christian resistance to the State. P. 7
- The Rev. Theo Kotze tells of the youth club „Route 12“ sponsored by the Methodist Church at Sea Point. P. 10
- The last section of Thom Kerstiens' introductory lecture at the Third World Congress of the Lay Apostolate (Rome, October, 1967) appears on P. 11
- Stephen Hayes, a South African theological student in England, informs our readers of his interesting impressions of the renewal of the Roman Catholic Church in the Netherlands. P. 14

Inleidingsartikel:

„*Ons Vyande*”

Die uitdrukking „vyande van Suid-Afrika” is een van daardie betekenisvolle slagwoorde wat in die politieke en kerklike retorika soos dit in ons land beoefen word, besonder goed te pas kom. Onder die talle sjibbolet's waarmee iemand hom as 'n ware volkswens en patriot kan bewys en waarmee hy sy plek in kerk-en-volk kan verseker (soos kommunisme, liberalisme, Christelik-nasionaal, Roomse gevaar, ens., ens.) val die kuns om op die regte tyd en plek, op die psigologies-geskikte moment in te slaan met: *Ons vyande*.

Klaarblyklik word daarmee verwys na een en almal wat afwysend staan teenoor die rassebeleid wat in die Republiek gehuldig word. Of dit nou van ons eie mense hier of van vreemdes dáár, of dit nou uit 'n kerklike of uit 'n politieke sfeer vandaan kom, of dit nou werklik 'n selfverklaarde „vyand” is wat hom teenoor ons stel of nie, almal wat apartheid veroordeel is géén vriende van ons land nie.

Natuurlik is dit vir ons ook lank reeds duidelik: Wie hierdie maatstaf aanwend om vriend of vyand te identifiseer, ontdek dat Suid-Afrika nie juis op veel vriende kan roem nie. Dan is ook dié deel van die wêreld waarmee ons geestelike verbondenheid en politieke gemeenskaplikheid die innigste behoort te wees, nl. die Christelike Weste, teen ons gekeer en ons eie huis wemel van sy vyande.

Nou is die feit dat vrywel die hele wêreld afwysend staan teenoor die politiek wat in Suid-Afrika gevoer word, as sodanig nog geen bewys dat die „wêreldmening” reg is en dat ons verkeerd is nie. Dit behoort ons egter tot diepe onrus te stem dat die „vyande” van Suid-Afrika nie slegs 'n gelid van politieke magte is wie se motiewe moontlik, en miskien selfs met grondige rede, gewantrou en gevrees kan word nie, maar dat ons onder dié wat ons landsbeleid verwerp ook die Christus-belydende Kerk in die wêreld sien staan.

Dit is vir ons eenmaal nie moontlik om alles wat ons landsbeleid weerspreek en veroordeel, as „wêreldmening”, as die antichristelike en onchristelike gees van die kommunisme en die liberalisme te verfoei nie. Die Christendom soos hy hom tans in die wêreld manifesteer, is teen ons. Of liever: Met ons landsbeleid gaan ons direk in teen die Christelike geloof en belydenis soos dit alom in die wêreld gehuldig word. Ons ontken dit met 'n volgehoue hardnekkigheid dat ons rassebeleid nie met die Christelike evangelie gerym kan word nie; dat die belydenis dat Jesus die Here is, geen ruimte laat vir 'n wêreld-, lewens- en mensbeskouing wat op die lees van ras en kleur geskoei is nie. Die radikale „nee” wat die Kerk van Christus in die wêreld daarteen uitspreek en sy ontkenning van die aanspraak dat wat in Suid-Afrika geglo en gedoen word in die naam van die Christendom geskied, beantwoord ons met 'n volhardende „ja” wat tegelyk 'n radikaal-afwysende „nee” is teenoor die getuienis van die ganse wêreldchristendom. Tensy ons dus aan die algemene Christelike oortuiging in die wêreld alle outoriteit wil ontsê en ons eie ideologie as

onaantasbaar en onteenseglik-Christelik waan, is dit slegs redelik en logies om tot die gevolgtrekking te kom dat Suid-Afrika teen die stroom van die Christendom ingaan, dat die politiek wat hier bedryf word, ten minste wat die wêreldchristendom van vandag betref, antichristelik is.

Laat ons dit egter argumentshalwe stel dat daar selfs só 'n moontlikheid kan bestaan dat die hele Christendom in die wêreld in sy feitlik unanieme veroordeling van alle vorme van rasse-diskriminasie nie die lig van Gods Woord het nie maar hom in die duister bevind, en dat Suid-Afrika die enigste plek ter wêreld kan wees waar die Christelike geloof nog suiwer bewaar word en waar Gods wil reg geken en gedoen word, dat ons hier uit die hele dekadente en verworde Christelike wêreld oorgebly het „soos 'n skerpie in 'n wingerd, soos 'n slaapplekkie in 'n komkommertuin, soos 'n beleërde stad” (Jes. 1:8). Laat ons aanneem dat die „nee” van die wêreldchristendom teenoor ons rassebeskouinge verklaar moet word uit die gees van liberalisme en kommunisme wat in aller harte gevaar het en waarvoor al wat leef (behalwe ons, en groepe soos die Ku Klux Klan en die antikommuniste in die V.S.A. en miskien die N.Z.A.W. in Nederland) geswig het. Kan ons dan met ons rug teen die muur van die Skrifwaarheid staan, in die oortuiging van ons onversteurde gemeenskap met die Christendom van die eeue en met die uitroep van onwrikbare geloofsekerheid op ons lippe: „As God vir ons is, wie kan teen ons wees?”

Ons het hieroor blykbaar nog nooit tot die nodige klaarheid gekom nie. As ons by „ons vyande” alles en almal reken wat veroordelend staan teenoor ons rasse-ideologie, moet ons God self en sy Woord, Christus self en sy evangelie noodwendig ook in daardie kategorie plaas. Die onverenigbaarheid van 'n rasse-apartheidsideologie (en al die diskriminasie en onreg wat dit onvermydelik meebring) met humanistiese en sosialistiese politieke beginsels en programme, is 'n geringe saak vergeleke by die verdoemende oordeel wat die Skrif daarvoor vel.

Die martelaarskap wat ons land homself op die hals gehaal het, is nie een ter wille van die waarheid van die Christelike geloof en die belydenis en uitlewing daarvan in 'n bese wêreld nie. Dit is 'n sinlose martelaarskap waarin ons nie slegs die wêreldmening teen ons het nie, maar waarin ons inderdaad in 'n toenemende eensaamheid sal staan in 'n onsalige verwydering van God wat die mens na sy Beeld geskape het en die broederskap van alle mense wil, en by Wie daar geen aanneming van die persoon is nie: van Christus wat Homself in 'n selfversakende liefde geoffer het vir sondaars sonder onderskeid en Hom nie skaam om hulle broeders te noem nie; en van sy evangelie wat ons oproep om mekaar aan te neem soos Christus ons ook aangeneem het en dié gesindheid in ons om te dra wat daar ook in Christus Jesus was.

Erger, veel erger as 'n „wêreldmening” wat teen

ons is, is die feit dat ons vir ons 'n wêreld- en lewensbeskouing ontwikkel het op die pseudo-Christelike, religieuse grondslag van 'n rasse-apartheidsgeloof wat niks anders is nie as 'n tipiese verskyningsvorm van die **wêreld** se mening, van die wysheid van die wêreld in die sin van I Kor. 3:19 wat lynreg ingaan teen die mening van die Gees wat deur die wêreldkerk vertolk word. As dit van hierdie mening van die wêreld waar is dat die normatiewe instansie van sy denke, spreke en handele nie die bindende outoriteit van Gods Woord is nie, maar die belange van die mens soos deur homself bepaal, dan is dit duidelik dat hierdie

einste Geesweerstruwende mening van die wêreld die geeste in ons land gevange geneem het.

Maar die ergste is dan tog dit, dat ons vroeër of later in ons stroomop-vaart ontgogel gaan word in die ontdekking dat die Here self soos 'n vyand geword het (Kl. 2:5). Die taal van die Skrif is te duidelik dat ons dit anders sou kan verwag. En wat dit kan beteken as alle oproepe tot bekering op dowe ore val en die Here vir 'n volk soos 'n vyand geword het, word in die boek Klaagliedere aangrypend beskrywe — en die wêreldgeskiedenis oor 'n tydperk van twintig eeue van Christendom het daarvan smartlike herhalinge gesien.

Editorial:

“Our Enemies”

The term “enemies of South Africa” is one of those vague slogans which suits political and ecclesiastical rhetoric as practised in our country particularly well. The art of hitting out at the right time and place, at the psychologically suitable moment with: Our enemies, belongs to the category of the numerous shibboleths (such as communism, liberalism, Christian-National, Roman danger etc. etc.) with which one can give proof of being a true man of the people and patriot and with which he can ensure for himself a place in church-and-people.

It obviously refers to one and all who are critically disposed towards the racial policy being practised in the Republic. Whether such criticism derives from among our own people here or from foreigners yonder, whether it emanates from an ecclesiastical or a political sphere, whether it really be a self-declared “enemy” pitting himself against us or not, all who condemn apartheid are decidedly no friends of our country.

It has long since become clear to us, of course, whoever employes this yardstick to identify friend or enemy soon discovers that South Africa cannot pride itself upon many friends. Then also that part of the world with which our spiritual bonds and political communality should be the most intimate, viz. the Christian West, is opposed to us and our own house teems with enemies.

Now the fact that practically the whole world looks with disfavour upon the politics pursued in South Africa is, as such, no proof yet that “world opinion” is right and that we are wrong. It ought to give rise to grave disquiet, however, that the “enemies” of South Africa are not merely an array of political powers whose motives could possibly, and even with good cause, be distrusted and feared, but that we observe also the Christ-confessing Church in the world standing in the ranks of those who reject our national policy.

It is simply not possible for us to decry everything that contradicts and condemns our national policy as mere “world opinion”, as the anti-Christian and unchristian spirit of communism and liberalism. Christianity as it manifests itself in the world at present is against us. Or rather: with our national policy we are running directly counter to Christian faith and confession as held everywhere in the world. We deny with persistent obstinacy that our

racial policy cannot be reconciled with the Christian gospel; that the confession that Jesus is the Lord leaves no room for a view of life, the world and man which is based on the foundation of race and colour. Our answer to the radical “no” pronounced against it by the Church of Christ in the world and to its denial of the claim that what is believed and done in South Africa is happening in the name of Christianity is a persistent “yes”, which is at the same time a radically rejecting “no” with regard to the witness of the whole of world Christianity. Unless, therefore, we are prepared to deny all authority to general Christian conviction in the world and to deem our own ideology unimpeachable and undeniably Christian, it is only reasonable and logical to come to the conclusion that South Africa is running counter to the stream of Christianity, that the politics practised here, at least as far as world Christianity today is concerned, is anti-Christian.

Let us, however, for argument's sake, suppose that even such a possibility may exist that the whole of Christianity in the world, in its virtually unanimous condemnation of all forms of racial discrimination, has lost the light of God's Word and is fumbling around in darkness, and that South Africa could be the only spot on earth where Christian faith is still preserved in its purity and where God's will is rightly known and done, that we here are the only ones left in the whole decadent and perverted Christian world “as a cottage in the vineyard, as a lodge in a garden of cucumbers, as a besieged city” (Is. 1:8). Let us suppose that the “no” of world Christianity toward our racial views must be attributed to the spirit of liberalism and communism which has taken possession of all hearts to which all who live (except we ourselves, and groups like the Ku Klux Klan and the anti-Communists in the U.S.A. and perhaps the N.Z.A.W. in the Netherlands) have succumbed. Can we then stand with our backs to the wall of Scriptural truth, in the conviction of our undisturbed communion with Christianity throughout the centuries and with the cry of unshakable certainty of belief on our lips: “If God be for us, who can be against us?”

In this regard we obviously have never yet attained the necessary clarity. If we count as “our enemies” all and everything condemning our racial ideology we must necessarily also place God Him-

self and his Word, Christ Himself and his gospel in that same category. The irreconcilability of an ideology of racial apartheid (and all the discrimination and injustice inevitably entailed by it) with humanistic and socialistic political principles and programmes is but a trifle compared to the damning judgment concerning it given by Scripture.

The martyrdom which our country has brought upon itself is not one for the sake of the truth of Christian faith and the witness thereunto and realisation thereof in an evil world. It is a senseless martyrdom in which we do not only find world opinion directed against us, but in which we will actually find ourselves increasingly isolated in a wretched estrangement from God who created man after his own Image and wills brotherhood between all men, and Who has no favourites; from Christ who sacrificed Himself in self-denying love for sinners without differentiation and is not ashamed to call them brethren; and from his gospel which calls us to receive each other as Christ also received us and to bear in us that mind which was also in Christ Jesus.

Worse, far worse than "world opinion" being

against us, is the fact that we have devised for ourselves a view of life and the world on the pseudo-Christian religious basis of a belief in racial apartheid which is nothing else than a typical phenomenon of the **world's** opinion, of the wisdom of this world as described in 1 Cor. 3:19, which runs directly counter to the opinion of the Spirit which is interpreted by the world Church. If it be true of this worldly opinion that what is normative for its thought, words and action is not the authority of God's Word, but the interests of man as determined by himself, then it is clear that this very Spirit-opposing opinion of the world has taken possession of the spirits in our country.

But the worst of all is truly this that sooner or later on our perverse course we are going to be disillusioned by the discovery that the Lord himself has become as an enemy (Lam. 2:5). The language of Scripture is far too clear for us to expect anything else. And what it could imply when all calls towards conversion should fall on deaf ears and the Lord has become as an enemy to a people is graphically described in the book of Lamentations — and the world history has observed painful repetitions of it in the course of twenty centuries of Christianity.

GEESTESKWELLINGE

Die Dooie God

DR. W. BRUCKNER DE VILLIERS

Gerugte omtrent die revolusionêre God-is-dood-teologie het ook ons land onlangs bereik — hierheen oorgewaaï uit Europa, Engeland en Amerika (wat vanselfsprekend 'n stoere bende aartskonserwatiewes hier te lande onmiddellik laat uitroep het: nou wat kon jy anders juis uit dié oord verwag?)

En sekerlik is daar veel, behalwe die blote naam reeds, wat vir ons hoofsaaklik Calvinisties ge-oriënteerde Suid-Afrikaanse blanke bevolking aanstootlik is aan dié nuwe rigting wat, op kultuurvlak altans, darem te veel herinner aan ons plaaslike **bêtes noires**, die Sestigters, met wie ons tot ons skade en skande opgeskeep sit in hierdie twintigste eeu wat ons (d.w.s. veral die „behoudende” element onder die blanke Afrikanerdom) krampagtig en desperaat probeer reguleer ooreenkomstig die sedelike en ander norme wat in die negentiende eeu (of is dit nie werklik die sestiende nie?) gegeld het.

Nogtans gee hierdie gewaagde nuwe denkrigting darem vir 'n paar van ons, wat nie onmiddellik die aapstuipe kry oor die bese vermetelheid van die hele ding nie, veel om oor na te dink.

Volgens ons kan agterkom, is die ontwikkelende God-is-dood-teologie tot 'n groot mate die geestesprodukt van veral 'n jonger garde avontuurlike godgeleerdes wat hulle op hul beurt in die plek gestel en in die geestestoestand ingeleef het van die moderne

menslike jong geslag, die berugte „hippies” inkluis. Wat beteken die tradisionele God van die eeue-oue en wesenlik versterkte Christendom nog vir ons? so lui die argument. Is Hy nie lank reeds in werklikheid dood nie? Het Hy nie lank reeds Sy bestaansreg ingeboet in 'n moderne wêreld wat daagliks onder die skaduwee van die waterstofbom lewe nie? Het die ou voorskrifte, sedes en gewoontes wat ons vaders en voorvaders eerbiedig het en waarvolgens hulle hul lewens ingerig het, nie lank reeds sinneloos geword in 'n wêreld wat môre nog katastrofies om ons ore kan ineentuimel nie?

'n Mens, selfs ons ouer mense, begryp iets van hierdie stuwende ongeduld, hierdie desperaatheid, hierdie vertwyfeling, hierdie ontugtering. En dit betaam ons ook nie om, bloot omdat ons waan dat ons begryp, dan maar agteroor te gaan sit en die hele ding af te maak met 'n versugting oor die ydelheid en rebelseid van die jeug nie.

Want hierdie jeugdige rebelle het voorwaar iets van die waarheid beet en ons het nog nie te oud geword om

onself en ons eie lewens te ondersoek en om te erken dat daar veel is wat skort in die wêreld wat ons vir onself en ons kinders geskep het en dat hulle terdeë die reg daartoe het om dit wat ons tot stand gebring het, onder die soeklig te neem, om soveel gedrogteliks wat ons geskep het, te verwerp en te vernietig en om die valse gode wat ons deur die jare heen vir onself opgerig het, te ontmasker in hul koue doodsheid.

ONS EIE MAAKSEL

Saam met ons opgroeiende kinders moet ons ons inderdaad begin afvra: wie is dié God wat ons aanbid wanneer en indien ons dit nog doen? Is Hy werklik nog die „God van ons Vaders”, die God van die Bybel, die Almagtige Vader van ons Here Jesus Christus? Of het Hy reeds heeltemal 'n ander God geword, 'n mensgemaakte God, die skepping van ons eie selfsug en gerieflikheidsdrang? Is Hy inderdaad nog die lewende God of het Hy 'n dooie God geword teen wie die nugterdenkende en kritiese geeste van ons tyd die reg het om in opstand te kom?

Het Hy nie 'n blote Sondagsgod geword nie — wat ons met vroom gesigte tydens ons credienste en godsdienssaamkomske op die Sabbat bely, terwyl ons die res van die week

wy aan die werke van die duiwel; 'n soort bo-wêreldse Voorsitter wat die stoel inneem tydens elke vergadering van die skynheiliges en sy goddelike sanksie aan hul geykte godsdiensbeoefening en Sondagsritueel verleen? Het die God wat so baie vandag aanbid nie so 'n God geword nie? Of liever: het ons, wat Hom aanbid, Hom nie tot so 'n wegwerplike God gemaak, omvorm nie?

Het Hy nie in ons tyd slegs 'n geleentheidsgod geword nie — een wat ons aanbid slegs as die geskikte geleentheid hom voordoet, op Wie ons vroom roep om hulp slegs wanneer ons in die nood is; een wat by uitstek inpas in die patroon van ons Gelofte en Helderdaed, ons kerklike, maar veral ons volkskerklike feesgeleentheid; die een aan Wie elke vormlike Skriflesing-en-gebed deur 'n dienstige dominee gewy word waarmee ons so lief is om ons politieke vergaderings en stryddaed te „open“?

Het Hy nie dalk wesenlik 'n gerieflikheidsgod geword nie? Verval ons nie alhoemeer in die versocking om Hom aan te roep, om ons aan te matig om in sy heilige Naam te spreek en op te tree slegs en veral wanneer dit in ons kraam te pas kom, wanneer dit vir ons gerieflik is om na Hom te verwys, wanneer Hy 'n handige skuiling vir ons gekwelde gewetens bied nie?

Het Hy nie, veral hier in ons eie land, verword geraak tot 'n heidense volksgod nie — 'n eksklusiewe God wat net tot ons eie volk (d.w.s. spesifiek die Afrikanervolk) behoort, wat al ons uitsprake en daed, selfs die onregverdigste, genadiglik sanksioneer, maar wat die bose inmenging van ons „vyande“ in ons landsake regmatig oordeel en straf, aangesien Hy geen gepeuter met die outomaties geseënde lotgevalle van sy uitverkore volk hier te lande ongestraf laat verbygaan nie?

En dan rys onmiddellik ook juis in hierdie verband die lastige vraag op: is dié God in Wie se Naam daar oor die afgelope aantal jare heen deur ons landsregering soveel krenkende, onmenslike en dikwels diaboliese wette en regulasies uitgevaardig is veral t.o.v. ons groot skare minderbevoordegte nie-blanke landgenote en medeburgers, werklik nog die God wat ons vadere aanbid het, die God van die Bybel, die lewende God? Is dié God wat, soos nou pas weer te Meran-Limeville, goedkeurend toesien dat daar 'n skreiende onreg in sy Naam en onder die dekmantel van Christelike voogdyskap gepleeg word deur die onbekookte verwydering van honderde Bantoesinne van hul geves-

tigde woonplekke na 'n kaal en onherbergsame vlakte, dan nie 'n hartelose, dooie God nie?

OORDEELSFOUT

Die God-is-dood-profete van ons tyd het dit mis en begaan 'n fout wat grens aan die godslasterlike. Want die ware God, die God van die Skrifopenbaring, die Vader van onse Here Jesus Christus, leef en sal vir ewig lewe — wat mense ook al van Hom dink of te sê het.

Maar hulle is ook nie heeltemal verkeerd nie, dog begaan alleen 'n ernstige oordeelsfout wanneer hulle meen dat dié God wat hulle as dood beskou, ooit werklik gelewe het. **Hierdie mensgemaakte God, hierdie God wat deur perverse mensegeeste ontwerp is om in die kraam van mense te pas, is voorwaar 'n dooie, 'n doodgebore God. Of as Hy ooit werklik „gelewe“ het, dan het sy menigte aanbidders doeltreffend daarvoor gesorg dat Hy, saam met sy „waarheid“, doodgemaak word — net soos hulle voorgangers daarvoor gesorg het dat Christus gekruisig word.**

Dog die ware God bly ewig lewe ten spyte van al die ydele pogings van die afgodediensars om Hom te omskep na hul eie sondige beeld. En vreeslik sal sy wraakgerig oor hulle én, helaas, hulle kinders wees wanneer die dag van oordeel aanbreek.

* * *

Summary

THE DEAD GOD

The author, with a certain measure of mischievousness, uses the so-called God is Dead theology of our times as a launching pad from which to fire some very searching and embarrassing questions.

Is the God Whom we, especially we here in South Africa, worship nowadays, he asks, still in fact the living God, the God of our fathers, the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ? Or has He become a false God, a man-made God and therefore in reality a dead, heartless God?

Has He not perhaps been transformed by sinful men into a mere God of our Sundays — while we serve the devil during the rest of the week? Has He not become only an occasional God, Whom we worship only on special occasions, on highdays and holidays? Has He not become a God of convenience Whom we worship only when He suits and serves our purpose — one Who exonerates the injustices we commit in his Name

and acts as a shield for our troubled consciences?

Has He not, especially in this country become a heathen people's God — a national God who belongs to our people exclusively, blesses even our most unjust actions and hopelessly confounds our "enemies" who have the effrontery to interfere in our affairs?

If so, then He is indeed a dead God, a still-born God, a God brought to death by his own self-serving worshippers. And yet the true God lives in eternity and will surely punish in his day of wrath those idolators who have dared to recreate Him after their own sinful image.

JEWISH AND CHRISTIAN STUDENTS MEET IN GENEVA

"We have found that there are agreements and disagreements within and between our two groups, and we are convinced of the value of such a confrontation". This is part of a statement published at the close of a Jewish-Christian student meeting held in Geneva, October 30th to November 3rd.

This meeting, organised for the first time by the World Student Christian Federation and the World Union of Jewish Students, was attended by 40 students coming from several countries throughout the world around the theme: "The People of God and Society".

Theological problems were presented by Rabbi Alexandre Safran of Geneva, and M. Robert Martin-Achard, Professor of Old Testament in the Theological Faculty of Geneva. Political and social problems were presented by Mr. C. I. Itty of the WCC Youth Department, and Mr. Jean Halperin, Professor of Economic and Social History at the University of Zurich.

The student statement requests among other things that close relations be established between WSCF and the WUJS and that other meetings of this kind be organised in the future, not only internationally but on the local and national level as well.

(*Ecumenical Youth News, Geneva.*)

IMPROPER INTERFERENCE BILL PLAYPENS AND POLITICS

DR. CALVIN COOK

The introduction of this Bill last year sparked off a controversy that resulted in the creation of a special parliamentary commission to investigate its implications. The Bill was born of concern to prevent electioneering and other political malpractices among the coloured community, and if possible to ensure that the new political institutions proposed to replace parliamentary representation, were free from taint. For politicians who had learned their politics in white communities, or observing them, were politicking among coloureds using the same methods they had found effective elsewhere.

The government wished to protect its coloured wards from becoming the victims of such well-known political abuses as bribery of voters, impossible election pledges, 'undue influences' of one kind or another, that elsewhere are as normal as they are undesirable. In addition to these common malpractices, there was a subsidiary aim to protect coloureds from wasting their votes by choosing candidates from opposition parties, and from the introduction of these irrelevant divisions into coloured affairs.

The preamble of the Bill sets out in wonderfully contradictory terms this fundamental ambiguity: it is a manifesto disguised as a statement of fact. Now contradiction is certainly not inadmissible in politics; it could be argued that most politics are the simultaneous pursuit of incompatible ends. But in this case, where the goal is 'self-realization', the means suggested are almost from the start such as to make this impossible.

PURPOSE

The chief purpose of the Bill is to prevent all activity, which in the opinion of the minister responsible (who is white) constitutes 'improper interference' by one group in the affairs of another. While the primary purpose of the Bill is to police political activity among coloureds, particularly at election time, the provisions of the bill include all other forms of contact that might contribute either directly or indirectly to such interference. It is for instance, proposed to make even meeting together for study purposes illegal.

In all of this, one can appreciate both the ministerial purpose — to

prevent undue influence being exerted on those who cannot defend themselves, or who have no wish to defend themselves — and the ministerial dilemma, to attempt to determine at which point influence passes into interference. The minister himself is in the impossible position of being himself one of the parties in the issue, and hence has the almost impossible task of determining which practices are in fact improper. The only criterion is what the minister may think improper, and he has good reason to be prudish. Can there be contact without corruption? Without the manipulation of ignorant, innocent or unsuspecting voters for ulterior motives, the consequent muddying of the neat thesis that true development rests on separation.

Except that the coloured community is almost coeval with the white, there is an almost exact parallel between this and the parent anxious about the malign social influences that will impinge on his child the moment he leaves the controllable atmosphere of home for the uncontrollable environment of school. Both parent and minister face the question of how much 'alien' influence how soon? And both are likely to find their decision being largely taken out of their hands by the fact that the child has been listening to radio serials in the back-room.

There is no easy answer to this question, nor one that is universally acceptable. Parents and children differ and bicker over rates of development. The range of political activity envisaged for coloureds is roughly comparable to the functions of Provincial Councils. Thus they will recapitulate the general political development of the country. But despite the intentions of those who determined

a pattern of self-government for the Union, our country's political development has been one in which in every serious conflict between central and provincial authority, victory has gone to the central government. The history of the Provincial Council in Natal is likely to be that which most nearly prefigures that of a coloured council. 'Self-realization' for Natal has largely been the acceptance of a self manufactured elsewhere in the republic.

POSSIBLE?

Two questions need to be asked about such attempts to isolate the coloured community. First, is such isolation still possible? Second, even if it possible, is it desirable?

The advocates of this bill hope to achieve a germ-free political atmosphere the like of which is unprecedented in this country. But this aim ignores the fact that contact with the white is both the reason for and the essence of coloured life. The coloured is unthinkable without such contact, and thus to cut off at this point in his history that which has been one of the staples of his existence is not to help 'self-realization' but to impose something quite alien. The bill proposes that all traffic between coloureds and other racial groups shall pass over the viaduct of official channels. Is this possible in a unitary country like ours? The difficulty about the question lies in the fact that only when it has been carried to its final conclusion can the question of possibility be settled. Meanwhile the patient must suffer the amputation of every ligament that binds him to the rest of the country while the surgeons press on to their end. There will always be persuasive voices in this age which is likely to reach the moon to urge us not to dismiss too summarily any notion as lunacy before it has been proved such. But proof here is always liable to be just over the horizon.

Even supposing such a purpose were to be achieved, and all commu-

nication severed except for official channels, there remains the undisposable problem of the nature of this influence. The fact that this control would be central and white would mean it would exert an undiluted influence upon the development of the institutions concerned. This would be to create an imperial factor, not of splendid complexity made up of red-coats, traders, missionaries and teachers, but of pure Whitchall. Coloured political life would be largely formed by and dependent upon this contact with central authority. Its fundamental character could not be other than administrative and alien. Yet the healthy development of political life has always been to set a priority upon the parliamentary and the indigenous. For if the present condition of the coloured has been brought about by white laissez-faire — or by the demands of the white community for its own development, the future is likely to bear the mark of bureaucratic overanxiety where it is not also marked by the continued subordination of coloured interests to white.

The institutions and structures of government in our country are unitary. They are also for the moment, white. This unitary character also affects all forms of association and influence: church, press, radio, and other means of communication and contact are organized assuming a common society despite cultural differences. Some institutions, such as the church, are multi-racial in composition, and transcultural in character; others become so because this is the pattern of the country. A nationalist, as opposed to a national church is a contradiction in terms; on the other hand, sectional interests have a place which becomes absurd when emphasised above the fact of common nationhood. Racial difference is only one factor in cultural diversity; it is becoming increasingly less important than other differences, such as education, or whether one's basic attitude to authority is permissiveness or paternalist. The gap between the A programme and Springbok Radio is always likely to be wider than that between either of these and any likely coloured broadcast station.

DESIRABLE?

Hence to the second question. Supposing it were possible to produce such a laboratory isolation, would it be desirable? There are obviously

those who think that such politics would be desirable. But the politics produced under such laboratory conditions would be an unrecognizable species, lacking the elements that make politics elsewhere; genuine conflict of interests, the marzipan of ideological contention, the sweat, smoke-filled rooms and other means of arriving at deals by which political policy is made and carried out elsewhere. What happens to the politician brought up to observe the Marquis of Queensberry's rules when he discovers that the ultimate decisions are made by other codes? Is it possible to imagine European politics run according to the proposed code — without 'undue influence' or interference? And if not, why not? Could it be that the framers of the bill have become used to considering politics merely an exercise in administration? Politics are in fact indivisible, and the rules obtaining in the country as a whole must finally determine all local styles; national issues creep back into local health boards.

One of the peculiarities of contemporary African politics is precisely the mixtures of styles demanded of the politician. He has to be able to perform with skill on tribal drums and at the same time know his way about the international orchestra. This mixed style, which Smuts introduced to the confusion of his admirers has now become common currency; these are the rules of the political game at this time. If the government wishes now to enter the field of political education, and to teach its coloured chicks how to scratch for themselves, it must not commit the traditional educator's mistake of educating for the past instead of the present and future. Separating local from national and international may appear to make the educator's task easier, but removes his lesson from reality to abstraction. If the purpose of this bill is to ensure fair play in the nursery school of politics, nothing is served by running it like a ballet class.

Yet it seems as if the attempt is to be made at the cost of obstructing or prohibiting every institution and association whose traditional way of working is across racial barriers. This, despite the fact that common development is at least as much a tradition of this country's life as is separate development. For the current situation of this country is that men and women have in fact, in growing numbers and through many ways and

associations, learned to understand and work together despite their diversity. This has made our country what it is. Moreover, this particular proposal flies in face of our experience of the gospel in our land; that there is no human institution, not even the state itself that does not stand in constant need of the grace and forgiveness of God. None can pretend to infallibility, though many do; none is exempt from making with the best will and intentions, the most terrible and grievous errors. If there is one requirement which is clear it is that real education must budget for the contingency of repeated errors. The development of any part of a community's life cannot be kept error free. Again, the community concerned must judge what is or is not interference, and experience shows that in political affairs, influence of any kind, to the degree it is effective in achieving the aims of some, is regarded as interference by others. Ironically therefore the greatest interference of all is likely to come from the government itself.

ALTERNATIVE : RECONCILIATION

Even more important for those who are not only citizens, but Christians, is the fact that we live by a gospel of reconciliation. Thus we must suspect impulses towards unity that do not take their rise in Christ as spurious and atheist. On the other hand, we must attend to the complementary truth: that in Christ, those who were once enemies can be, and have been reconciled with one another. **The most serious criticism of this attempt to separate is that it treats the coloured people as if their race were the most important feature of their life. For a Christian, the faith of a person matters more than his race. If for its own reasons, the state regards racial classification as supremely important, Christians must continue to regard such classification as provisional and secondary. To do otherwise is to make the work of Christ's cross of none effect. To be sure, we have nullified that work often enough in the past, and have thus created conditions that cry for reform. But such reformation will come, not from adopting separation as final, but in recognizing that the key to the development of this, and of every other nation's life remains always Christ's reconciling work.**

CHRISTIAN RESISTANCE TO THE STATE

— A Theological Inquiry —

THE REV. HANS HÄSELBARTH

The first years following Independence Day in the new states of Africa north of the Zambesi have opened for the Christian Churches many new avenues of involvement in the political affairs of their countries. In the wake of rising nationalism there came a growing awareness of political responsibility among Christians for the civil welfare of their fellow-people, and this in turn will necessarily stimulate new thinking about the basic relationship of Church and State on the African continent. The Churches in Southern Africa will have to look with interest at experiences made in this new chapter of African Church History and will try to keep in contact with their sister Churches to the north as far as this is possible.

It is inevitable in such a process of re-thinking that also a traditional question of Christian Social Ethics, namely the borderline-question of the Christian's resistance to the state, is included. To put it more precisely: When and under what circumstances are Christians allowed to take part in a revolution? Can one say that there is either Christ the Saviour or Barabbas, the political zealot, and that this alternative, from the outset, settles the question? It will be interesting to have a brief glance at answers given by the Church in the course of her history. It will become clear that there are two major turning points in the development of thinking on this issue, namely the rise of the modern state during the age of Enlightenment and the experiences of Churches made in and before the Second World War.

(I)

(a) From the New Testament to the Age of Enlightenment.

Coming from the New Testament passages like Rom. 13:2; 1 Peter 2:13 and 1 Tim. 2:1, Christians have by and large emphasized their constructive co-operation in matters of civil welfare rather than resistance to their authorities. However, from the time of the Church Fathers down through the Middle Ages and the time of the Reformation, there runs a line of thinking — motivated by N.T. texts like Acts 5:29 and Rev. 13 — which under the pass-word "death to the tyrant" maintained as an "ultima ratio" that citizens are no longer subject to a public order which the rulers themselves have ravaged. In the Protestant Churches of the 16th and 17th century the Calvinist tradition — due to historical circumstances and theological empha-

sis — was generally more explicit on this issue than the Lutheran sister-Churches. One can make mention of Calvin's famous "loop-hole" in the last chapter of his Institution which makes provision for the possibility of resistance by lower political authorities (Book IV, ch. XX, section XXXII). The Confessio Scotica even speaks of the disposal of a tyrant as a good work which carries the promise of divine reward.

Among Lutherans, in a later and one-sided interpretation of the so-called "doctrine" of the two regiments, it was often feared that a mixing of theology and politics could occur and consequently the participation of the Church in a revolution was rejected. This was held mainly in opposition to the more radical ideas of enthusiast, pacifist and Anabaptist groups to the left. It had to be either Luther or Thomas Münzer, a leader in the German peasant-revolt in 1524/25. One spoke of political interference as an "alien" office of the Church and therefore in later times the static divine order of the state was emphasized rather than a pragmatic thinking about the functions of the state and the ensuing human rights of citizens. It must however be seen that Luther, who is generally regarded as most conservative, did agree to the death of a tyrant whose lawlessness has turned him into a "monstrum", who follows his wicked aims rather than God's will. (See: H. J. Iwand, *Das Widerstandsrecht der Christen nach der Lehre der Reformatoren*, in *Nachgelassene Werke* 2, München 1966, pp. 193-230). We thus find in the tradition of Christian theology a clear difference being made between a just and an unjust ruler — and the condemnation of the tyrant was kept alive in and after the Reformation.

(b) The Rise of the modern State

This tradition seems to cease after the religious wars in the European age of Enlightenment. The proclamation of human rights threw new light on what past ages had said about resistance to the state. Many features of the state appeared now as tyranny which had been no tyranny before. Although the Christian faith had helped to shape the new ideas of civil liberties, the Churches were now confronted with an emancipated natural law which they suspected. Thus they sided more readily with conservatism and establishment. The right to resist to the state appeared more and more as doubtful, because Christians did not want to be regarded as rebels or terrorists who destroyed the maintenance of order and threatened to bring about anarchy. So the Churches became silent on this point and it is interesting to find out the inner motives for this trend.

Augustine had once defined the basic difference between the heavenly and the earthly kingdom. This was now forgotten. Suddenly the state appeared as an organ of divine revelation, service to the state was automatically service rendered to God. State and Church were seen together as two sides of one and the same thing, like body and soul, outward reality and inner spirituality belong together. The Church is only the subjective and inward side of the state. Not the particular state, but the idea "State" is the real God in history. Hegel, the German philosopher of the early 19th century, has most clearly expressed this type of thinking (in his "Rechtsphilosophie", 1821). Even the most evil state is still God's manifestation, the affirmation of life against the chaos of anarchy. All other expression of life is finite and subjective, but the order of the state built upon reason is immortal in the course of history. Therefore any resistance to the state out of a moral obligation is unrealistic, destructive and negative; it either appears as fanaticism or as terrorism. Even religious motives for resistance are subjective when held against the unchangeable course of world history in which the idea of the state is the

objective reality. Where this philosophy dominates the Church must live in conformity to the ideology of the state.

How do we in South Africa regard ourselves?

Are we "Hegelians" in the sense mentioned here with our tribal background on the one side or with our concepts of nation and "volk" on the other side — or are we confessing Christians?

(c) New Insights in Dark Times

It is enough to get a glimpse of the frame-work of these ideas and their cruel perfection in order to understand why Christians had to resist when the philosophy of Hegel finally received its perverted interpretation in the Nazi-regime. The 20th of July, 1944, the day when an attempt was made on the life of the dictator in Germany, is the end of an age which has led us to a radical re-assessment in matters of obedience to the state. Some of the insights gained in this struggle by Dutch, Norwegian, German Christians — and by many others — can be summed up like this:

- Every government is indirectly a servant of the Lord Jesus Christ by whose grace it rules.
- For Christians the obedience to Christ may in extreme cases imply disobedience to the worldly authority.
- Governments have no mandate to claim allegiance in matters which are contrary to the laws of Christ.
- Where ultimate loyalty is demanded, such governments do not only overstep the limits of their mandate, but turn into their very counter-part.
- Whenever Christians resist to the state under these conditions they must be prepared to accept suffering for the sake of the Gospel as a natural consequence.

Urged by the call of their conscience Christians suddenly found themselves in the place of "freedom-fighters". Their insights, unheard of and revolutionary up to those days, depended theologically to a degree on a little essay of the famous Swiss theologian Karl Barth which was significantly called "Justification and Justice" (1938). He maintained that the state itself cannot ultimately define what justice is. Real justice — so already Augustine in "De Civitate Dei" II, 21 — can only be upheld in a community whose leader is Christ Himself. Our earthly justice must re-

flect something of the justification in Christ's Kingdom where grace is justice and justice is grace. Only such justice is humanitarian and guards and judges men rightly. Therefore any standards of justice set up by reason must not become absolute (this is the answer to the system of Hegel), but must to a degree reflect the justice of God's Kingdom. This daring theological approach provided the measure for Christians at that time to realize their political responsibility, but also indicated the limits where resistance to injustice and perversion of authority was demanded.

(d) The Post-war Era

In the years after the war the conscience of many Christians was alive because of recognized guilt. Too often the Churches had offered incense to the rulers of the day instead of opposing the deadly totalitarianism of a state which had lost its moral integrity. It became evident — maybe for the first time after the chapter 13 of the book of Revelation had been written — that a state can be perverted into its counter-part, from God's provisional order into the beast of the abyss. Under the shadow of such states there remains only a narrow space for the witness of Churches. Where the Church wants to pray for the government she faces a power-structure which is bewitched by ideologies and guided by a sense of secular messianism. In order to re-discover the true function of a government the Church must first strip the existing authority from its ideological background. Where she wants to pray for the nation, she faces groups of people who are set apart in tribes, who are indoctrinated against each other, isolated by fear, tradition and ignorance. Where then is the government, where is the nation for which the Church might intercede? This is her dilemma today (so Martin Fischer in "Obrigkeit". Unterwegs series 10, Berlin 1959, p. 19).

We in Germany realizes that such a development was no blind fate, but was in fact the outcome of what had been prepared over the decades. We received what we had wanted. (This is brought out clearly by H. J. Iwand in his essay "Zur theologischen Begründung des Widerstands gegen die Staatsgewalt", Nachgelassene Werke 2, München 1966, pp. 230 ff. to whom the author is indebted in gratitude and whose deep insights are partly made use of in this article).

We had chosen power instead of

justice. We had wanted to live and survive in the Church without having to confess. The revolution that broke in from the right, was imposed on us with the argument "we have to defend ourselves against Communism" and we believed that. We did not realize that, wherever in public life the freedom of the conscience is tied, also outward civil liberties are quickly eliminated. As we were thus bound by tradition and wishful thinking, we were weak when opposition to the laws of injustice was finally demanded. So resistance remained limited to private attempts of individuals. As a society we had deprived ourselves of moral and political means to safe-guard the state from falling into the abyss of destruction. Our insight into this development was overshadowed by reactionary powers and romantic ideologies. This was our guilt.

From an awareness of this guilt and from repentance that followed there rose the resistance-movement in these years. Suffering and action brought Christians and non-Christians closer together. But it was no chance that on July 20, 1944 so many noble men were in fact Christians. That was the rising Christian conscience against the horrible.

How much of this past struggle is relevant for the Churches in today's Africa? For some of them this witness, if known, may be extremely meaningful, although one cannot simply reproduce the motives and the situations into our present age. Repentance is an inner, spiritual process which cannot be transformed into a general awareness of others. It rather begins in the depth of the individual conscience as an act of purification which is necessary where men strive for new horizons. This means that the way for a confessing Church of the future must be opened by God himself and his Holy Spirit. The tomorrow which we approach in repentance and hope, in South Africa as well as in the Churches further to the north, must show a new face different from the age from which we once departed. To such a renewal belongs also a new understanding of the rôle of Christians in the state in which they live.

(II)

After this brief survey of the past we can try to summarize the insights which former generations have gained on the issue of Christian resistance to the state.

1. Codes of morality which define what is good or evil are not given to the state but must be preserved by a responsible society which is the intermediate entity between Church and state.

Where the state uses its power to call evil what is good and to glorify the evil — there the hour has come to take the sword out of the hands of the state. It does not belong there anymore. In the resistance of Christians under such circumstances the bright vision of a state is kept alive which does not belong to the devil but which remains God's provisional order even today.

2. Therefore resistance to the state for Christians springs from a high evaluation of the state itself. The concern is that a state which is to preserve peace and justice among citizens may not turn into its opposite. Christians can never give up and leave the wicked state to its own devices, they can never emigrate from it, either spiritually or legally. Those who regard political power as evil in itself, will naturally hand politics over to the evil forces. Christians however recognize the state as being a gift of God, as his indirect and provisional servant. Therefore active and passive resistance tries to transform a perverted state into what it originally

was destined to be, namely a power which serves righteousness.

3. Active resistance in extreme cases of injustice must be undertaken by persons or groups who have expert understanding of the political necessities of their country. There must be a predictable chance of success in order to avoid unnecessary sacrifices. The future alternatives must be planned and known, for it is the error of revolutionaries to simply confer the authority of ruling upon themselves. Failure may not always be interpreted as a negative judgment, but even less can success automatically mean ethical justification. Works do not justify, and more than ever are Christians at this point dependent on the forgiveness of their Lord. There will be no escape from tragic conflicts, from guilt and suffering and it becomes clear that the doctrine of the justification of the sinner by faith alone has in fact political consequences for believers.

4. Romans 13:2 is spoken against those who, without discriminating between good and evil, undermine a state authority. It depends very much on who sets the measures for what a lawful state is to be and what not. Many ask whether even an unjust government is still an order of God. The answer must be that even a state which is bound by ideologies and does

not follow God's law is still instituted by God. God has means to bring about its downfall. It is therefore a hazardous teaching to say that only a lawful state must be obeyed, but that in any other state one can only plan sabotage or else emigrate to another country. This demands too much from the ordinary Christian. Who simply ignores or hates the government abandons his civil responsibility for the world. In this "either — or" type of thinking the ideologies are not defeated. This again makes it clear that resistance can only be an "ultima ratio", a border-line decision. To live and remain under an unjust government, thereby confessing the Lordship of Christ wherever possible, will remain the "normal" way for Christians. But it is equally true that the same God who binds citizens to a government also makes them free and unafraid in such a state.

5. So once again: resistance against measures of the state is only possible for Christians where the basic honour of its function is unreservedly accepted. Suffering and persecution cannot be explained from the original function of the state, but only from the perversion of this function. Since Christians honour the God-given function of states, they share in a positive and deep sense in the preservation of the ruling order — even where they have to oppose it.

Obituary

THE REV. J. PATERSON WHYTE, M.A.

Presbyterian ministers from all over the Transvaal, and some from the Cape, Natal and Rhodesia, formed part of the large congregation which attended the funeral service of the Rev. J. Paterson Whyte at St. Mark's Presbyterian Church, Johannesburg, on Tuesday, 9th January. Mr. Whyte was General Secretary of the Presbyterian Church of Southern Africa, Clerk of the General Assembly, and a former Moderator of the Church. The service was conducted by the Rev. John Hawkrige, minister of St. Mark's Church, together with the present Moderator of the General Assembly, the Rt. Rev. T. L. Clarke, of Port Elizabeth.

Brought up in a long family tradition of service to the Presbyterian Church, James Paterson Whyte graduated at Glasgow University and subsequently com-

pleted his Divinity course under such notable figures as Professor James Moffat, whose translations of the Old and New Testaments are standard works. He came to South Africa in the 1920's and exercised his ministry at Premier Mine, Roodepoort, and North End, Port Elizabeth.

At the outbreak of World War II he joined the army as a private, but at the express desire of both military and Church authorities became a chaplain to the forces. He served up North in this until the end of the war and on his return joined the Department of Social Welfare of the Johannesburg Municipality.

In 1950 he accepted the appointment of General Secretary to the Presbyterian Church, and in 1964 had conferred upon him the highest honour and office that

the Church can bestow, that of Moderator of the General Assembly.

He was an accomplished golfer and well-known on the courses of Port Elizabeth and Johannesburg.

One of his colleagues said after the service: "We all knew him affectionately as 'Jim'. He endeared himself to so many, whether pursuing his calling in the Church, or relaxing on the golf course, that he will be remembered as much for his warm qualities, as for the distinction of the offices he held."

Mr. Whyte died suddenly on Sunday, 7th January. He leaves his widow and two sons, John and Hamish. His surviving brothers are Mr. Quintin Whyte, Director of the Institute of Race Relations, and the Rev. David Whyte, of Inverarity, Scotland.

Q. W.

ROUTE 12 – YOUTH EXPERIMENT IN DEPTH

THE REV. THEO KOTZE

ROUTE 12 — so named for obvious apostolic reasons, and because it is on Cape Town's bus route 12, where crowded buses travel every three minutes throughout the day to SEA POINT; second only to Hillbrow in density of population.

What is Route 12? A Youth Club, sponsored by Sea Point Methodist Church, and run entirely by young people for young people.

It all started with a small group of young people deeply concerned about the "teen-age problem" in Sea Point, where loneliness, aimlessness, drug addiction, carelessness, lack of parental control, broken homes . . . are rife.

Just over a year ago, the trustees of Sea Point Methodist Church took the bold step of buying a new manse, to make the old manse (situated between the Church and the hall) available for youth work. In the event they invested R25,000 in the young people.

That investment has paid handsome dividends, and today there are:

- 80 young people between the ages of 16 and 26 who, on a roster basis, sacrifice at least 2 evenings a week to do duty at the Club.

- 18 carefully selected young people who, in two groups, are being trained by two of Cape Town's leading psychiatrists. For this purpose they have to utterly commit themselves to one evening's groupwork per week.

- The full-time staff consists of (1) a nineteen-year-old girl, Lynette Hoskyn, who has just won the "Cape Argus" Teenager of the year competition, and who will later this year be sent overseas for specialised training; (2) a young American woman of 23, Helen Ewer, a Bachelor of Sociology, who is working in the club for six months.

- There are 12 departments, each with its own administrative head (some are older members of the Church, but the majority are in the age-group mentioned above):

Administration, Coffee Bar, Confidence Room, Worship, Programming and Entertainment, Folk Club, Sports (this includes a Soccer Club with three teams in the Western Province Football League), a Badminton Club, with teams in the W.P. league, Table Tennis, Tennis, Skin-diving, Indoor games such as billiards and snooker, chess, volley ball,

library, Drama Society, Hobbies Room (with a very well-equipped woodwork workshop), Community Service, Juniors i.e. Inters Club (11-15), Mini Club (girls 7-10), 7's Club (boys 7-10).

Main features of Route 12 are:

Coffee Bar: Open every night of the week, except Tuesday;

Confidence Room: Where trained young people are on duty every night;

Sunday Night Worship: At 9.00 p.m., run by the young people themselves.

The Coffee Bar is the gathering place and "contact point", where leaders can befriend people who come to the Club. There is no religious atmosphere, and no attempt to proselytise.

The Confidence Room is still a developing feature, but obviously the Club's most important factor. Young people are encouraged to share their problems with those on duty. Difficult cases are referred to the group meetings with the psychiatrist, or to the minister of the Church, who also conduct personal interviews and/or set in motion processes for the person's treatment, and relate them to the life of the Church.

The Worship Service is at 9.00 p.m. every Sunday. Dress is informal — "Come as you are". Modern religious songs, with guitar accompaniment, are a feature and the leader, who is often (but not always) the Minister of the Church, enters into dialogue with all and sundry. Behind this is the basic conviction that for centuries the Church has answered questions no one really asks, and so the Minister exposes the Christian faith to the hard and searching questions that young people do ask. Discussion continues in the Coffee Bar and the Confidence Room after the service.

Club membership at the moment stands at 154, but the average turnover per week is 340. Any number, from 100 to 150, attend the Sunday night service. The Church is, therefore, meeting young people where they are, at their point of need, encouraging them to make the best use

of their talents and, where opportunity arises, bringing them into a full-orbed Christian life.

We stress that although Route 12 has now been in existence for more than a year, it is still in the experimental stage. We have had difficulties, made serious mistakes, got into trouble on more than one occasion — certainly we do not have all the answers — but we believe with Colin Morris that "It is better that the Church should be sincerely wrong through taking positive action, than immaculately right, but totally irrelevant, through doing nothing at all."

DÁAR GEBEUR TEN MINSTE IETS . . .

Hoe moet ons die ontwikkeling in die Rooms-Katolieke Kerk beoordeel? is onlangs aan Karl Barth gevra. (Lees ook op bl. 11)

Sy antwoord: Nie met optimisme nie, maar met hoop. Ons moet ons verheug oor die beweging wat daar deur die konsilie gekom het en nie steeds 'n waarskuwende vinger wys omdat hulle nog nie hervormd is nie. Daar is nou natuurlik weer moeilikheid met die gemengde huwelike, maar dáár gebeur ten minste iets. **Ons** is in hierdie dae besig met ons reformatie-herdenkinge. **Ons** rus op die louere van Luther en Calvyn.

Op 'n ander vraag, oor **wat daar in die ereiens moet verander**, het Barth o.m. geantwoord: Die Nagmaal moet daar in. Nie soos 'n aanhangsel, so nou en dan nie, maar met die hele gemeente, elke keer.

Daarin is die Katolieke ons vooruit. Ons preek ook te lank. Twee-en-twintig minute is genoeg. Ek luister elke Sondagmôre eers na die Katolieke en dan na die Protestantse radiopreek. Die Katolieke word steeds beter. „Ach, du liebe Zeit". As nou die Katolieke nie slegs elke Sondag die Nagmaal het nie maar ook nog goeie preke kry, dan kan ons as jubilerende Protestante maar inpak.

(Oorgeneem uit: *In de Waagschaal*).

BARTH OOR DIE „GOD IS DOOD” -TEOLOGIE

In die Nederlandse dagblad „Trouw” het onlangs ’n stuk verskyn oor ’n vrae-uurtjie by die bekende Switserse teoloog, Karl Barth, in ’n restaurant in Basel.

Een van die vrae wat aan Barth gestel is, sou (vanselfsprekend!) een gewees het oor sy opinie van die nuutste produk op die teologiese mark: die „God is dood”-teologie. Die vraag het gelui: **In Duitsland is daar mense wat die teologie van die dood-van-God aanhang. Hoe moet ons dit opvat?**

Barth se antwoord: Hierdie mense is nie slegs in Duitsland nie. Hulle is ook in Switserland en in Amerika. Ja, daar heeltemal. Maar ek sou eers iets anders wil sê. Ek weet cintlik nie wat erger is nie, dié mense wat dan sê dat God dood is of die ander wat ook in die kerk sit en wat lewe asof God dood is. Is daar origens iemand van ons wat kan beweer dat hy nog nooit gedink en geleef het asof God dood is nie? Wat nou die uitdrukking betref. Dat God, wat ons deur Jesus Christus ken, dood sou wees, is ’n onsinnige bewering, dwaser as wanneer ek van myself terwyl ek hier sit sou sê dat ek dood is.

In die Christelike Kerk het die dood van God wel betekenis op Goeie Vrydag. Dan sing die Kerk hier: „O grote nood, God self is dood”. Dit is waar, maar alles wat waar is, hoef nog nie gesê te word nie. Ek sou dit liever nie sê nie. God, die God wat leef en deur Wie ons mag lewe, is nie dood nie. Ja, daar is mense wat dit sê. Onder andere „’n beroemde dame” Sölle. Dit word voorgedra as ’n geweldige vonds. Wat hulle bedoel is dat ’n verre vreemde God in die hoogte dood is en dat ons sy begrafnis kan gaan vier. Nou, neem die uitdrukking nie alte ernstig op nie. Dié God word nie begrawe nie want hy het nooit bestaan nie.

(Oorgeneem uit: *In de Waagschaal*).

“GOD’S PEOPLE ON MAN’S JOURNEY”

(Continued)

THOM KERSTIENS

In our January issue we offered our readers the first section of Thom Kerstien’s stimulating introductory lecture at the Third Congress of the Lay Apostolate of the Roman Catholic Church, held in Rome in October, 1967. Those of our readers who read the first section and found it interesting, will be doubly anxious to read this final section.

RELIGIOUS CULTURE AND COMPETENCE

This leads me to a further condition of change and one which concerns each of us directly. Witness on our part demands on the one hand that we make a serious effort to ensure that our religious culture is on a par with our secular formation. There is no more sorrowful sight than the layman who has attained a far-reaching specialization in his professional life, but who, in his religious culture, has remained at the 5th grade of primary school. His witness is likely to become contra-productive as he looks like a dressed-up gorilla in God’s earthly paradise.

On the other hand, it is an equally necessary condition of the layman that he be competent in his professional field, whether he is a bricklayer, doctor, metallurgic engineer or a radio commentator. In our world to be nice is never a sufficient excuse for being incompetent, for then we might want to appear as tigers but we are in fact cows that nobody is interested in milking.

We forget only too often that the one thing this world of ours is crying out for is competence, mixed with that wisdom which comes from religious contemplation.

THE NEED FOR ORGANIZATION

To help in the creation of the conditions which will allow us to become adult Christians who have the competence to serve modern civilization and its redemption, we need institutions and organizations which must be forward-looking and open to change.

I cannot possibly agree with those who feel that the Church does not need institutional forms to incorporate itself in civilization.

In theory it is very attractive to speak of the animating spirit which should replace Christian organizations. However I am afraid that this mentality belongs to medievalist dreamers, who should study why totalitarian governments, whether from the right or the left, have always started with initially suppressing Christian lay organizations before moving directly against the Church Hierarchy.

I am with Daniélou if he says that: “The proclaiming of the gospel message demands publishing houses and the media of press, radio and films. The formation of Christians demands schools, youth movements, adult groups. Maintaining a place in the world of ideas demands research centres and universities”.⁷

This does not mean, and history proves it, that without organizations nothing can be done. We have amongst us, and I would particularly like to salute them for they are an example and inspiration to us all, committed Christians from countries where all forms of the apostolate are strongly hampered by oppressive governmental measures. Similarly we have also delegates from countries — and I sympathize with them equally — where the hierarchy does not seem to realize the importance of the organized apostolate in the temporal sphere.

However the conditions *sine qua non* of lay organizations or institutions is that they are flexible and forward-looking and open to change, for the aim of the organization can never be its very existing. One field in which they can and should experiment is that of ecumenism, as we shall see in our discussions.

We already note today, and this might be more so in the future, that organizations involved in the temporal sphere sometimes hold opposite

views, which is why they cannot involve the Church as an institution directly in their work. Nevertheless, their activities can be of great use to the Church, as they can bring new ideas and thinking to the fore on subjects which require an ongoing knowledge of intricate situations or facts, provided that all sides are in favour of a dialogue with the common good as its aim. In the future such organizations will grow and we must start getting used to the idea that in our Church on certain points we must agree to differ.

PROBLEM OF COMMUNICATION

Much of the tension existing today, and many of the mistakes made in the past, can be attributed to a failure in communications. This does not only mean that lines of communication between the hierarchical Church and the laity must be established, but also that we are mutually willing to communicate.

Again in these organizations and institutions of different kinds can help greatly.

This problem is not only a local or national one; it might be of greater dimension on an international level. The Church, since Vatican II, is moving very rapidly into an era of change and experimentation. The measure of change and the kind of experiments will depend greatly on regional circumstances. To safeguard the unity in diversity of the Church demands thorough information and knowledge of many complex situations.

We therefore rightly rejoice in the efforts now under way to set up advisory councils, comprising committed Christians, at parish, inter-parochial and diocesan levels, and we are grateful for the creation of the Pontifical Commission "Justice and Peace" and the Laity Council.

It will be extremely important, after perhaps an experimental period, that democratic procedures should be followed regarding selection of candidates, terms of office, meetings, etc. This Congress might well set the tone for such democratic procedures, in that nobody should hesitate to speak his mind, but that all should be willing to give way to majority opinion. In this regard we might draw attention to the experience of the Conference of International Catholic Organizations, whose activities threaten to be over-shadowed some-

what by the new institutions now created.

PART IV

SOME KEY QUESTIONS

I now come to my last point. Whilst we are up-dating ourselves and our instruments we should try to give valid answers to the questions put to us. Let me formulate some and you will be discussing many others.

● Must we not develop a new economic philosophy which is neither liberalistic nor socialistic, but which has as its finality men redeemed by Christ and collaborating in His design of ongoing creation — a philosophy which will strike a balance between economic efficiency and human fulfilment?

● Is there a morality in international trade and commerce, as there is on the national level, and without which we cannot overcome the injustices now existing in the relationship between the developing and developed countries?

● If "Gaudium et Spes" states: "If a person is in extreme necessity, he has the right to take from the riches of others what he himself needs",⁸ and "Populorum Progressio": "If the world is made to furnish each individual with the means of livelihood and the instruments for his growth and progress, each man has therefore the right to find in the world what is necessary for himself",⁹ — what then should our attitude be towards revolutionary movements in different parts of the world? Must we see revolution as the consequence of an illusion lost about evolution, or revolution as an illusion of evolution?

● Is racial discrimination a sin to be confessed?

● What new fields are open for Christians in the "Secular City" about which Harvey Cox wrote such an interesting book?¹⁰

● Must we forget the values of meditation and contemplation for a world in a hurry and substitute the psychiatrist for the parish priest?

● What ideals does Christianity offer to modern youth?

● If there is "no alternative to peace" and "development is the new name for peace", what do we do to ensure the conditions for such a peace?

Let me go briefly into the last two questions. There is an increasing danger that the Christian Churches, especially in the Western nations, will

be ignored by youth. Our youth has presumably no more nor no less faith than the youth of the past. However, it is better educated, better nourished, and has less financial worries than its forefathers had. It is also, I believe, more sincere as well as a bit more cynical about big theories and lofty ideals which are not seriously practised. We note this clearly in the Communist run countries of Eastern Europe as well as in Russia, where we find youth groping for an authentic humanism which puts man at the centre of things.

With us in Western Europe we notice somewhat the same process. Young people do not turn away from Christianity because they find it too exacting, but because they find it too "bourgeois", not demanding enough, not capable of galvanizing the generosity of youth for worthwhile causes. They get bored with life, but remain very sincere in their search for authenticity. Therefore some of them turn to pseudo-religious experiences, as in Zen, or to L.S.D. or psychedelics.

What we should offer in our Christian institutions is a more radical evangelical approach, especially regarding the problems of peace and development. The American Peace Corps has shown that youth is willing to serve its fellow men; can we not invent a similar service?

Paul VI has now twice launched an appeal to create a world fund, to be made up of part of the money spent on arms, to relieve the most destitute of this world. What reactions have we had so far? Praise in the papers and pooh-ha-ha's in the chancelleries!

If, however, we were to mobilize our Christians to induce the governments of a number of nations to start giving the example, something might be accomplished. A disarmament of the nations in Latin America which have such a great Christian tradition cannot possibly upset the world balance, but might make enormous resources available for the development of their countries. The same could be said about the Benelux countries in which Christian parties play such a big rôle in governments.

Furthermore, in some countries the possibility now exists for young people, if they are willing, to serve in development projects in order to be exempted from military service. However, we note that many of these young people are frustrated because they do not know to whom they

should turn, or because organizations are unable to pay their travel or a minimum salary.

Could not this Congress support efforts in this field? Could we not slowly but surely move to a state where compulsory military service would be replaced by compulsory social service, for men as well as for women? Men to be available to fight against poverty at home or abroad, girls to be available for social services, caring for the aged, the physically handicapped and other categories of our modern marginal men.

It is a fool's vision to believe that maybe if we start, a situation could arise whereby, if our children were to be asked: "Where did you serve?" they would not have to reply: "In the 15th Division" or "In the Royal Navy", but could state: "I served in a hospital in the Congo, a school in Cochambamba or a road building project in Cambodia".

BIBLIOGRAPHY

7. Article by Jean Daniélou, S.J. in "The Critic", June/July, 1967.
8. "Gaudium et Spes", par. 69.
9. "Populorum Progressio", par. 22.
10. "The Secular City", Harvey Cox, MacMillan Company, New York, 1965.

CORRECTION

In David Perk's article *Identity, Ecumenism and Loyalty* in our December issue, the fourth sentence in the paragraph under the head *Challenge* on p. 13 should read: If ecumenism were to be interpreted as an invitation or challenge to man to break down the boundaries and barriers of his identity and to merge into worlds outside it, it would be doomed to failure.

The third sentence in the paragraph under the head *Resistance* on the same page should read: Courage and strength of character are necessary to enable a person to face up to the charge of disloyalty that is levelled at him by those with whom he is associated in institutions and ideas when, individually, he reaches out to fresh ones beyond them.

„AAN DIE GEES VAN CHRISTUS VREEMD“

„Onder die hindernisse wat die integrale ontwikkeling van die state in Afrika kan bemocilik, is ook die rassediskriminering te noem wat hom helaas ook in Afrika in swaar en uiteenlopende uitinge vertoon.

Die rassisme in sy verskeie vorme is op 'n duidelike wyse en herhaaldelik deur die Tweede Vatikaanse Konsilie veroordeel as 'n benadeling van die waardigheid van die mens, as „vreemd aan die Gees van Christus“ en „teen die plan van God“, en ons het dit self in „Populorum progressio“ betreur as 'n hindernis wat in die weg staan van die opbou van 'n regverdiger wêreld wat meer aan die algemene solidariteit sal beantwoord. Ons wil ook graag daaraan herinner dat daar van die kant van Katolieke biskoppe nie versuim is nie, soos dit kort gelede ook nog gebeur het, om die stem te verhef, waar dit nodig was, tot verdediging van regte wat onder die voete vertrap word.

Soos bekend staan die gelykheid van die mense gegrond op die gemeenskaplike oorsprong en die gelyke lot van hulle wat aan die menslike familie behoort. „Aangesien alle mense 'n geestelike siel het en na die Beeld van God geskape is, aangesien hulle dieselfde natuur en dieselfde oorsprong het, aangesien hulle hulle as verlostes deur Christus oor dieselfde goddelike roeping en bestemming verheug, daarom moet die grondliggende gelykheid van alle mense steeds meer tot erkenning gebring word“. Dit vereis egter in die burgerlike samelewing 'n steeds uitdrukliker erkenning van die wesenlike regte van elke mens, al is dit ook so dat dit die verskille en die eie funksies van die enkele individu nie onderdruk nie maar dit intendeel respekteer en tot harmonie lei. Regmatig is dus die verlange van mense om hulle in daardie regte te verheug wat juis in die waardigheid van die menslike persoon hulle oorsprong vind“.

(Uit Pous Paulus VI se „Boodskap aan Afrika“, 29 Oktober 1967. Oorgeneem uit: *Sonderbeilage zur Zeitschrift „AFRIKA HEUTE“*, 1 Desember 1967).

VRAE VAN DIE KOMMUNISME AAN DIE KERK

Drs. G. Puchinger, skrywer o.a. van die interessante boek *Gesprekken over Rome-Reformatie* (Delft 1965), het onlangs 'n onderhoud gevoer met die Duitse teoloog, prof. Helmut Gollwitzer van die Freie Universität te Berlyn.

Van 1938-1940 was prof. Gollwitzer predikant van Berlyn-Dahlem. In 1940 is hy uit Berlyn verban vanweë sy verset teen die Hitler-bewind en is 'n spreekverbod vir die hele Duitsland aan hom opgelê. Vir vyf jaar lank was hy in Duitse militêre diens, en die jare 1945-1950 het hy in Rusland in krygsgevangenskap verkeer. In Mei 1950 het hy hoogleraar in die sistematiese teologie geword te Bonn.

Hier is een van die vrae wat Puchinger aan prof. Gollwitzer gestel het: **Watter invloed het die Kommunisme op die Christelike religie gehad, of behoort dit te hê?**

Antwoord: Die betekenis van die Kommunisme vir die Christelike geloof lê volgens my in die vrae wat dit aan die Christelike Kerk stel.

1. Is die Christendom, soos Nietzsche en Marx beweer het, slegs 'n verbesondering van die idealistiese wêreldbeskouing? En indien nie, hoe kon hierdie indruk dan ontstaan het, en wat doen die Christene daaraan om hierdie indruk te korrigeer?

2. Is die Christendom 'n religieuse uiting van die bestaande maatskaplike verhoudinge, met al die ongeregthede daarvan, en 'n rem op die energie om hierdie verhoudinge te verbeter?

Indien nee, vra ek weer: Hoe kon hierdie indruk dan tog gevestig word, en wat doen kerk en teologie daaraan om die Christendom te bevry uit die bondgenootskap met die reaksionêre magte van die maatskappy?

3. Waarom wek die onmenslikhede in ons maatskappy dikwels meer verset op by ateïste as by Christene? En waarom ondervind die toekomspektiewe van die Evangelie, wat op 'n broederlik-saamlewende vrye mensheid gerig is, veel meer belangstelling by die ateïste as by Christene?

Is dit in orde wanneer Marxiste aan hierdie toekomsvisie van die

Evangelie 'n aktuele betekenis vir die teenswoordige taak ten aansien van maatskappyverandering toeken — die Christene dikwels nie?

Die Marxiste is vandag die saakwaarnemers van die oer-Christelike utopie, en die Christene mag hierdie utopie nie aan die Marxiste oorlaat nie. Hulle behoort nie slegs te beklemtoon dat die verwerkliking van die Ryk van God slegs in die mag van God is, en nié in die mag van die mense sou lê nie. Hulle moet in-teendeel erken dat die visie van

die Ryk van God ons wil mobiliseer, nou reeds, om vooruit te gaan, op weg na die komende Ryk.

Ten vyfde: Is dit vir die Christene duidelik hóé sterk in die oë van die sosialistiese kritici die teenswoordige Christelike Kerk nog steeds verbonde is aan die bestaande maatskaplike verhoudinge? Deursien hulle hoe verdag dit alles vir die sosialistiese kritici voorkom, en dat hulle ou kreet, Religie is niks anders as opium vir die volk nie, vir hulle besef bevestig word deur die werklike ervaring?

Wat doen die Christene om hierdie verdenking, nie met woorde nie, maar met daad, te weerlê?

My hoop is daarop gevestig dat nuwe ervaringe wat die Kommuniste van die Christene mag ondervind, die tot nog toe bestaande negasie van die Christendom deur die Kommunisme sal laat verdwyn, en dat daarvoor in die plek sal kom 'n nuwe aandag van die Kommuniste vir die boodskap van die Evangelie.

(Uit: *Woord en Dienst*,
16 Desember 1967)

OBSERVATIONS ON THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH IN THE NETHERLANDS

— STEPHEN HAYES

It was suggested to me that the readers of *Pro Veritate* might be interested in some observations on the Roman Catholic Church in the Netherlands. I have been spending most of the Christmas vacation in an Augustinian monastery in Breda, but the time has really been far too short to get a really deep understanding of what is happening in the Church here. I can only tell you some of the things that I have seen and heard, and some of the impressions I have about what the Church is feeling and doing.

Here at Breda there are five Augustinians, and Maartenshof is a centre for the training of lay pastoral workers. It is a four year course, and lectures are given every Saturday, not only by the people here, but also from other Augustinian houses, Universities, etc. There is also a course for school-teachers which has lectures on Wednesdays and Saturdays. This is a theological course, for people who want to teach divinity in schools.

The community here has very few services, as compared with monastic orders in former times. The Eucharist is celebrated on most mornings, with a liturgy which has been compiled by the community. It is very plain and simple. The altar has only one candle, and the congregation sit or stand on either side. The service begins with a reading from the Bible, and then a Psalm is read, and two longer bible readings follow, with a Psalm in between each. Then there are intercessory prayers, which are composed by the community, and changed from day to day. The bread and wine are placed on the altar, and the thanksgiving prayer follows — there are four different versions used at Breda, all of them very much shorter and simpler than the old Roman Canon. This is followed by the Lord's Prayer, and Communion. The priest goes around with a plate and each member of the congregation takes his own piece of the broken bread. When the priest has finished distributing it, he returns to the altar, and takes a piece for

himself, and all eat it together, standing. One of the most impressive things about this is the freshness and newness of it all, and the great sense of Christian community. There is also no objection to non-Roman Catholics, like me, receiving communion. At another Augustinian house, at Nijmegen, there is a large modern chapel, and at the Sunday evening service there is a large congregation, not only of the monks, but also people from outside. The congregation is on three sides of the altar, and the pulpit is behind it — in some ways it is rather reminiscent of a Reformed Church. I was there on New Year's Eve, and the chapel (the *Boskapel*, it is called) was practically full, with about 300-400 people. There was a choir which leads the singing, but the congregation joined in enthusiastically. They managed to give the impression that they were enjoying themselves, and seemed happy to be there. As at Breda, the actions of the service were very simple. There was no incense, no mumbling in Latin, no gesticulations and signs of the cross. When it came to the dismissal at the end the priest wished everyone a happy new year, and the whole congregation replied.

This renewal which is apparent in the liturgy of the Church is not an isolated happening, but it arises out of a complete renewal in the way of thinking of Roman Catholic Christians in the Netherlands. It finds its expression not only in the services, but in the whole life of the Church. It is what would have been called in the past a 'spiritual revival' — but in the language of today one could only say that it is a revolution. This does not mean that there has been a complete change throughout the church, at every level. There are 'conservatives' as well as 'progressives' in the Church, as well as a fairly large number of people in between who go to church out of habit, and don't feel particularly strongly one way or the other. But the bishops as a whole are on the side of the progressives, and encourage new ways of thinking.

There are a number of lively magazines, and I shall quote from some of them, to illustrate the type of thinking which lies behind this renewal, and which also gives some insight into the tensions which arise from it. There is a small vocal group of conservatives as well, who have their own magazine — 'Confrontatie'.

'Kruispunt' is a Catholic magazine for laymen, and is intended for general readership. It is produced by several of the Dutch monastic orders, and published at the Augustinian Convent at Nijmegen (Graafseweg 274). I quote from an article called 'Er is geen terug meer' by Jo Heymans, a priest of the Passionist Fathers.

"Het is de discussie van de dag: de tegenstelling tussen jong en oud. Met opzet zal ik geen nadere toelichting geven . . . deze tegenstelling bestaat. Ze moet niet weggepraat en weggewuifd en weggemompeld worden, maar onder ogen gezien worden, koelbloedig. . . . Het grootste gevaar dat de Katholieke Kerken in Nederland kan lopen is deze tegenstelling te geringschaten of te verdonkeremanen."

"Ik heb van een gevaar voor de kerk gesproken, omdat deze tegenstelling zo fundamenteel van aard is. Er begint zich traag een tragiek af te tekenen, omdat er blijkbaar een onvermijdelijkheid op dit gebied ligt. Het fundamentele ligt hierin: er is een diepgaande ontwikkeling in de kerk bezig die door de ouderen niet meer tegen te gaan is, zelfs niet door de paus. *Er is geen terug meer!* Deze ontwikkeling uit zich niet zozeer in praktische aanpassingen op het gebied van de liturgie of het godsdienstonderwijs of in veranderde opvattingen over seksualiteit, maar ze uit zich in een veel moeilijker vatbaardere mentaliteitsverandering, die rechtstreeks op een scheiding der geesten gaat uitlopen. Het kon wel eens een vraag worden of in de ene kerkstructuur die we nog hebben geen twee kerken schuil gaan: een evangelische en een hiërarchische kerk."

"Steeds meer gaat er op lijken, dat er in de ene kerk twee soorten gelovigen zijn, die geen contact meer met elkaar hebben door middel van de dialoog, maar die in de loopgraven liggen door middel van de discussie."

"Het gaat om een totale ommekeer. Ieder van ons bevindt zich in dezelfde situatie waarin de Joden zich bevonden in de tijd van Christus: ook op ons doet het evangelie het beroep om de gevestigde kaders te doorbreken en om ons van de grond af aan te vernieuwen. Het evangelie plaatst ons in de crisis. Het zou belachelijk zijn te denken dat met een beaamde in plaats van een Latijnse mis de ommekeer in het geloven bereikt werd. We moeten totaal van mentaliteit veranderen. In volle kracht geldt voor ons het woord: het Rijk Gods is nabij; bekeert u. Bekeren wil zeggen: verander van mentaliteit en neem het evangelie aan. Maak u los van het verleden en de verstarde overleveringen. Er valt voor u niets meer goed te praten. Hier helpt geen zelfverdediging meer. Menigeen zal zeggen dat ik wel erg ongenueanceerd uitpak tegen de ouderen. Laat het dan de ongenueanceerdheid van het evangelie zijn. Het Rijk Gods vraagt een radicale breuk met het verleden en het evangelie is wel erg ongenueanceerd wanneer het zegt, dat iemand, die zijn vader en moeder meer bemint dan Christus niet waardig is, en het is zelfs bepaald onfatsoenlijk wanneer het bezwaren wegwimpelt met de verklaring: laat de dood hun doden begraven."

"Ik wil niet zeggen dat de nieuwe stroming zonder meer het Evangelie is, maar de vrijheid en de openheid die haar kenmerken zijn meer evangelisch dan de gezagsbeklemtoning en de hechte structuur van de oude kerk. In de nieuwe stroming en bij de jongeren ligt de mentaliteitsverandering die we ons eigen moet maken om niet op een dood spoor te geraken."

Not all the members of the Church in the Netherlands think like this however — let one of them speak for himself. in a letter to the editor of 'Kruispunt' —

"Wanneer iemand een nette brief schrijft, dan verlangt hij geen grapje als antwoord . . . Dit kan ik u wel zeggen: Kruispunt is het nog niet waard om te worden gebruikt als toilet papier, maar kan beter direct verbrand worden, alhoewel dit ook nog jammer is, want dan kost het ook nog een lucifer."

To a South African this seems very much like home. The division we know so well — the evangelical and the hierarchical Church, a division which is not confined to the Netherlands. In South Africa the terms 'verligte' and 'verkrampde' have a specialised political meaning, but they might equally well describe the mentality of church members. One of the Roman Catholic priests here describe the difference by the questions asked by members of the Church. When he comes to consider anything that seems like a church activity, the evangelical asks "Does this express the truth of the Gospel? Does this express our faith in what God has done for the world? Does this represent Christ to the world?" The conservative, the 'Confrontatie' reader, asks 'Is all this allowed? Who said you could do this? Has the Pope given permission?'

There is one major difference between these evangelicals and their counter-

parts in South Africa — and elsewhere. The renewal is something which is practical. It is not merely talk but action. It is thorough, and solidly based in the Gospel. There is also something like a feeling of permanent revolution — which is symbolised in the altar-books, prayer-books, and hymn-books — all of which are loose-leaf ring binders, so that new hymns and prayers can be added, and old ones discarded. In their liturgical experiments, they are not simply looking for a new liturgy which will last for the next hundred or five hundred years — they are looking for something here and now. The forms used by one christian community may not be suitable for another, the form used now may not be suitable in ten years time. The Superior of the Dutch Augustinians said that the Church in the Netherlands is fighting a war of decolonisation against the Italian ecclesiastical imperialists, and that they want autonomy for the local church, in the country, in the province, in the town, with freedom to change and find new ways of expressing its faith. Because of this stress on the autonomy of the local church, they are perhaps over-modest about their achievements, about what they can teach the church in other parts of the world. The New Catechism, which is not a work of isolated crankiness, but was commissioned and sanctioned by the whole college of the Netherlands bishops, is an excellent example of how the ordinary Christians can express their faith in the modern world. But they say that each local church must find its own expression for itself. They are not enthusiastic about translating the New Catechism into other languages.

In relations with other Churches there is also a great advance. The wider ecumenical spirit which has filled the Roman Catholic Church since the Second Vatican Council seems to be particularly far advanced here. The Roman Catholic Church and the Netherlands Hervormde Kerk recognise each others baptism, and to some extent there is a mutual recognition of their sacramental ministries. An example is Prof. van der Linde, a former dominee who was ordained priest in the Roman Catholic Church. His ordination illustrates a whole range of changes in the thinking of the Roman Catholic Church. For one thing, he was not first ordained deacon, as is customary, because they said he already held that office by virtue of having been a minister in the Herv. Kerk. At the ordination service, instead of receiving the chalice and paten from the bishop, he brought them to the bishop, to show that he was already a minister of the sacraments in another church, and now wished to exercise that ministry within the Roman communion. He is married, with four children — the second married Roman Catholic priest in the Netherlands. His wife and children, who were present at the ordination service, have remained members of the Netherlands Hervormde Kerk — which raises the question of the official church attitude to both married priests and mixed marriages. In both the Roman Catholic and the Reformed Churches there is considerable discussion of the nature and function of authority in the Church, and also the office of the minister or priest. Some reformed theologians say that the fact that Prof. v.d. Linde was not or-

dained deacon because he was deemed to hold that office already was based on a fallacy, because the office of the minister is tied to the community, and by leaving the communion of the Hervormde Kerk, Prof. v.d. Linde automatically gave up his office as a minister. Others say that if he went to another congregation, or another reformed church, he would not be re-ordained, and so that indicates that the ministerial office has some sort of permanence.

Another manifestation of this desire for unity and a drawing together of the Churches was at the ordination of the new Bishop of Breda, Hubertus Ernst. A new ordination service was used, and the following extract will illustrate the new attitude. These are some of the questions which the new bishop was asked, before he was ordained —

- Bent u bereid het evangelie van Jesus Christus getrouw en onverkort te verkondigen?
- Ja, dat wil ik.
- Bent u bereid leiding te geven aan het verlangen naar eenheid dat in uw bisdom leeft onder vele christenen?
- Ja, dat wil ik.

The sermon was preached by the Archbishop, Cardinal Alfrink, and an address given by ds. N. K. van den Akker, Chairman of the Noord-Brabant and Limburg Council of Churches. After the service, as the new bishop was leaving the church, the entire congregation burst into spontaneous applause.

One thing which has been deliberately not publicised has been the holding of Eucharistic services for catholic and reformed congregations, at which the catholic priest and reformed minister have concelebrated, and all have received communion together. But it is felt that at this stage too much publicity would be harmful — not so much for reasons of wanting to conceal what is going on, as because it is once again considered the business primarily of the local congregations concerned.

In the Netherlands the Church is frequently in the news, and church news gets about very quickly, partly because the Churches have a far greater opportunity to use the mass communications media here than they do in other countries. It might well be that this factor has played a significant part in promoting the renewal of the Church in the Netherlands, because issues which are being debated by theologians are almost immediately brought to the attention of the general church members and the public at large. Broadcasting in the Netherlands is not controlled by the State, as it is in South Africa, nor by commercial enterprise, as in America. The facilities — transmission apparatus etc., is State-owned, but the programmes are produced by Broadcasting Societies, which are financed by their members, and are given time on the air in proportion to the number of members they have. There are between 10-20 societies, which have to compete for members, and thus for the time they are allotted, and this competition makes the societies aware of their responsibility towards their members. The churches have set up their own broadcasting societies —

KRO (Katholieke Radio Omroep), NCRV (Nederlandse Christelijke Radio Vereniging) etc. There are also ecumenical societies, as well as the more general ones. The Christian Broadcasting societies between them have a large number of members, and so have probably more than half the broadcasting time allotted to them, on three radio and two television channels. This means that they cannot use all the time for 'religious' programmes, so they produce general entertainment programmes, and documentaries. The latter are of a high standard, and bring to the viewers and listeners problems and matters of Christian concern from all over the world. There are programmes on the plight of the Arab refugees in the middle east, social problems and guerrilla warfare in South America, missions in Indonesia etc. There are also church news programmes — interviews with theologians, and publicity given to questions being discussed in the church. In other countries, where broadcasting is controlled by the state, very little time is allotted to the church, and where it is all arranged by the personnel of the state broadcasting corporation, so all that gets across are a few religious platitudes, or a sort of 'nice thought for the day'. The Dutch system prevents broadcasts from being slanted, and makes it possible for minority views to be heard. Personally, I didn't find their entertainment programmes very good, but that is a matter of taste, and what there is no doubt appeals to the majority of Dutch viewers and listeners.

The manifestations of the renewal in the church have led many people into a state of anxiety for the future. When, as in the Augustinian convent at Breda, the monks no longer wear habits, and some of them don't even wear clerical collars any more, and have fewer and fewer services, this might mean that the Church is becoming worldly, and that the monks are losing their faith, the clergy and bishops are losing their faith, and the whole church, clergy and laity alike, are becoming indistinguishable from the world. In fact, it is just the opposite. The church is coming to see that it can only live by faith, and not by rules and regulations and prohibitions and permissions. But again, I have not been here long enough to judge, to be able to interpret this revolution. The worldliness of the church is a sort of holy worldliness. It is best put by another theologian, or rather, philosopher, Dr. Corn. Verhoeven, writing in 'De Bazuin' — another progressive Roman Catholic magazine.

"Wanneer over kerkelijke zaken gesproken wordt, gebeurt dat dikwijls in de trant van: de paus heeft weer een kans gemist om aansluiting te vinden bij de wereld van vandaag. Die aansluiting wordt dan ongeveer gelijk gesteld met iets als 'aggiornamento'. Ik geloof dat deze manier van praten grondig verkeerd is. Want op de eerste plaats wordt hier zomaar verondersteld dat de kerk een instituut is en dat ook wil weten. Dat instituut moet af en toe eens vernieuwd worden, en de wereld is daarbij een soort van ideale norm. Met die wereld onderhandelt de kerk niettemin op voet van gelijkheid, wat al een hele pretentie is. Op de tweede plaats veronderstelt

deze manier van praten, dat het een belangrijke taak van de kerk is zich met de wereld van 'vandaag' bezig te houden, en dan wel in bevestigende zin. Als de paus het gebruik van voorbehoedsmiddelen niet goedkeurt, zeggen allerlei mensen met een wijs en bezorgd gezicht dat hij de aansluiting met de wereld van vandaag mist. Maar waarom moet de paus die pillen wel keuren, dus goed- of afkeuren, ander pillen niet? Waarom mist de paus het zo fel begeerde aansluiting met de wereld van vandaag door zich niet uit te spreken over asperine of levertraan? Mist hij die aansluiting wel door zich niet uit te spreken over wat zo veelbetekend 'de' pil genoemd wordt? Er zijn belangrijker en ingrijpende geneesmiddelen en farmaceutische verworvenheden, die ook met wereldbevolking en het geheim van het leven te maken hebben en waarvan men volstrekt geen uitspraak van de paus verlangt. Terwijl de halve wereld als een drenzende kinderschaar de paus aan zijn sokken hangt om hem een uitspraak over 'de pil' af te dwingen, beschouwen diezelfde schapen de ontwikkeling en het gebruik van LSD als een volkomen wereldse aangelegenheid die alleen 'de aardse wetgever' aangaat. De selectie van gebieden, waarop pauselijke aansluiting met de wereld van vandaag geeist wordt is helemaal willekeurig. Dat komt voort uit het feit dat de eis onzinnig is. De wereld heeft geen behoefte aan die aansluiting, noch wat voorbehoedsmiddelen betreft en tabletten en het is volstrekt niet de taak van paus en kerk om in vol ornaat langs het lijntje te gaan staan en die ontwikkelingen toe te juichen. Degenen die dat eisen zijn misschien wel kerkelijk, maar in elk geval onwerelds. Het is niet de taak van de kerk de wereld in haar eigenmachtigheid te bevestigen. De paus heeft geen kannonnen te zegen, en ook geen pillen. Ik zou het eerlijk gezegd sympathieker vinden als hij de pil afkeurde — hoe onwerelds dat ook is — dan wanneer hij ze zou goedkeuren vanuit de pretentie dat hij hier überhaupt iets te keuren heeft. Dan zou hij in zijn dwaasheid duidelijker een stuk kerktegen-de-wereld-in zijn dan hij nu is. Hij zou een werelds triumfalisme ontmaskeren. Ik ben er, nogmaals, geen voorstander van dat hij dat doet, maar ik geloof ook niet dat hij door nieuwe verworvenheden ijlings goed te keuren de aansluiting met de wereld en dan nog wel de wereld van vandaag zou vinden waar hij die werkelijk zou moeten vinden. Geen kerk is zo reddeloos verloren als een die up to date is en helemaal in de pas met de nieuwste ontwikkelingen in de wereld. Zij is zelf wereld geworden zonder zout der aarde geweest te zijn."

Dr. Verhoeven puts his finger on what is perhaps the heart of the renewal of the Church in the Netherlands. After having spent two years in England, I have felt that the 'radical' Christians there want the church to be up to date as a part of the world's establishment. Many of them seem to continue to support the status quo, the establishment. They are indeed up to date, in that they see that the establishment is not what it was, that over the past few years and centuries the status quo has become something different, and in this sense they want to bring the church up to

date. In the Netherlands the revolution seems to go far deeper than this; in theology and in practice it is more sound, more thorough. If I may put it crudely, in England people are working for a revolution in the church so that it can re-establish itself in the 20th century, and no longer be a hangover from the past. In the Netherlands people are working for a revolution in the Church to bring about a revolution in the world. So I think Christians in South Africa would do well to pay attention to what is going on here, and thus catch a glimpse of what, by the grace of God, may be the church of tomorrow.

Letters — Brieue

WEES VERSIGTIG MET ROME

**Mnr. A. J. J. Burger, Marie, Pk. Wit-
vlei.**

In 'n voetnoot by die brief van P. G. Overduin (*Pro Veritate*, 15 Des. 1967) skryf u: „Verder wil ons hom vriendelik daaraan herinner dat ons ons nie meer bevind in die tyd van die konsilie van Trente (en van die Heidelbergse Kategismus nie!), en aan die hand doen dat dit vir alle Protestante gerade is om enig-sins te probeer tred hou met nuwere ontwikkelings in die Roomse Kerk" ens.

Ek verskil nie graag van u nie en deel ook nie die sienswyse van u korrespondent nie. Wat myself betref, het ek so goed moontlik probeer tred hou met die jongste ontwikkelinge in die Roomse Kerk, en dat daar 'n gunstige wending by individuele lede sowel as by sekere instansies te bemerk is, gee ek toe. Wat Rome self betref, staan ek egter maar baie skepties. Vir Rome beteken Christelike eenheid die aanvaarding van sy dogmas; by Rome is die eenheid, by Protestante verdeeldheid.

Laat ons tog maar liever die waarskuwing van ons Heer in gedagte hou: Wees versigtig soos die slange en opreg soos die duiwe. As ons Protestante met Rome begin heul, kan hy niks verloor nie dog slegs wen. Rome het nog geen teken laat blyk dat hy bereid is om toegewings te maak of van sy dogmas prys te gee nie. Aan die ander kant is ons erfenis te kosbaar en te duur gekoop met die bloed van martelare om dit te verkansel vir 'n valse eenheid. Die eku-meniese beweging is iets moois en prysenswaardigs, maar dan moet dit die eenheid soek van kerke wat van die hervorming uitgaan en die Skrif onvoorwaardelik as norm vir die Christelike lewe en belydenis aanvaar.

Dit alles wil nie sê dat ons nie ons broer (ook die Rooms-Katolieke) se wagger is nie. Saam met ds. Hegger (in *Moeder ek klaag u aan*) moet ons bely dat ons ons plig skromelik versuim het teenoor hierdie mense wat nie die suiwere waarheid ken nie en in gedurige vrees lewe omdat hulle nie die vryheid in Jesus Christus het nie. Moet dit ons nie uitdryf om hulle uit te help uit die dwaalleer waarin hulle verstriek is nie? Onder hulle is daar vroom mense wat

dit opreg bedoel. Laat ons vir hulle bid dat hulle ook die volle blydskap in Christus deelagtig sal word deur die suiwer evangelie aan te neem.

Ek kan geen heil sien in onderhandelinge met die Roomse Kerk nie. Voordat Rome nie ook reformeer en toon dat hy ook begerig is om weer kerk van die heilige Skrif te word nie, kan ek in hom nie die Kerk van Christus sien nie. Eers wanneer die Gees van die Here hom van sy dwaling oortuig het, sal die tyd daar wees om saam te werk.

Moet ons ons nie veel liever beywer vir 'n groter eenheid onder Protestantse kerke nie? Lê ons eerste taak nie hier nie? Dit is bedroewend om te sien hoedat Protestantse kerke, en ek dink hier veral aan ons drie Afrikaans-Hollandse kerke, hulle by die eerste teenstand (selfs oor die kleurkwessie) onttrek en afsonder. Ons stel onself en ons belange eerste, trek ons terug in ons eie hoekie en wens onself geluk omdat ons so suiwer in die leer is. Ons kan ons getuënis met vrug lewer in ekumeniese vergaderings sonder om ons eie prys te gee. Ons kan in die wêreld wees sonder om van die wêreld te wees. Laat ons dit ons doel en strewe maak.

A FIRST FAINT GLIMPSE OF LOVE

Elizabeth, Stellenbosch.

As Afrikaner I wish to express my appreciation of the article "In Defence of South Africa" by A. H. Clutton in your issue of January 15th.

It is the first faint glimpse that I have found in your journal of a curative love for the Afrikaner people in the dilemma in which we find ourselves.

Indignation at apartheid has made certain theologians develop a self-righteous pride at the little wings they are growing! Sometimes they remind us Afrikaners of the pharisee in the temple praising God that he had kept all the rules of the true faith.

We poor sinners, may only beg for mercy! For we were born into this nation and this Church and we do have a certain quality of loyalty.

Moreover in our whole Afrikaner tradition there has always been an affection and a poignant sympathy for our coloured folk who share our heritage, and with whom many of us have grown up and grown old. For this reason also we are ready to make very special efforts for our mission work, sometimes at con-

siderable sacrifice to ourselves — as was particularly the case last year.

We are not blind to the plight of our coloured brothers, and there are certain injustices which we categorically condemn. But we believe apartheid is a policy which is not static, and which is now changing and must evolve eventually into something infinitely better for all concerned.

Yet because we are so often — and sometimes unjustly — accused and attacked we are driven into a defensive attitude. If you are always condemning us, we react with fear and resentment.

The injustices of apartheid will only be eliminated, I feel, when all of us have learnt to love as we should. But where fear is, there we are paralysed and cannot love.

"Religion is caught and not taught", said Dean Inge. Perhaps if we could see in you a Christ love for *all* people — even for us — we ourselves may learn to love aright through "good infection". Perhaps, if we could find in you the Divine pity, also for us, you may heal and restore and recreate even our hearts — and perhaps you yourselves may then find a blessing and be made whole as well.

DIE TEOLOGIESE BOEKREEKS IN AFRIKAANS

— 'n Nuwe Benadering tot Verskaffing van Teologiese Literatuur ook vir die Leek

Ontwerp om te voorsien aan 'n voelbare leemte. 'n Nuwe ope deur tot deelname aan gesamentlike teologiese arbeid deur deelgenote uit al die kerke.

ALREEDS VERKRYBAAR . . .

R. Voipio, ALGEMENE GODSDIENSKUNDE • R. Voipio, GODSDIENS-
 ONDERRIG, 'N KATKISASIEHANDBOEK • T. Sundermeier, DIE BRIEF
 AAN DIE GALASIËRS • H. H. Rowley, BYBELATLAS • T. Sundermeier,
 DIE PROFEET HOSÉA • T. Sundermeier, GENESIS • O. Milk, MARTIN
 LUTHER, SY LEWE EN WERK.

VIR 1968 BEPLAN . . .

S. Löytty en U. Schüle, INLEIDING TOT DIE NUWE TESTAMENT • G. Lohse,
 DIE OPENBARING VAN JOHANNES • H. Schlimm, INLEIDING TOT DIE
 OU TESTAMENT • H. Berkhof, WAT IS DIE MENS?

WAAR VERKRYGBAAR . . .

DIE MORAWIESE BOEKDEPOT, Posbus 5, Genadendal, K.P.
 DIE BÜCHERLAGER, Posbus 71, Karibib, S.W.A.
 DIE FINSE SENDINGDRUKKERY, Oniipa, Ondangua, Ovamboland, S.W.A.



**PRO
VERITATE**