



PRO VERITATE

ALAN BUTLER

Trinity Church, Gaborone.

DAVID THOMAS

Mission '70.

RICHARD TURNER

The Christian and Politics.

COLIN WINTER

Agony and Ecstasy.

HELDER CAMARA

The Seven Deadly sins of the Modern World.

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

Volume VIII No. 9 | Jaargang VIII Nr. 9

15 JAN. 1970

PRO VERITATE

EDITORIAL

EDITOR:

Dr. B. Engelbrecht.

EDITORIAL COMMITTEE:

Bishop B. B. Burnett; the Rev. J. de Gruchy; the Rev. A. W. Habelgaarn; the Rev. E. E. Mahabane; Mr. J. E. Moulder; the Rev. C. F. B. Naudé (Chairman); Prof. Dr. A. van Selms.

ADMINISTRATION/ CORRESPONDENCE

CIRCULATION MANAGER:

Dr. W. B. de Villiers.

All letters to the editor and administration to: P.O. Box 31135, Braamfontein, Johannesburg.

SUBSCRIPTION

Subscription payable in advance.

Land and sea mail: R1 (10/- or \$1.40) — Africa; R1.50 (15/- or \$2.10) — Overseas; 17/6 United Kingdom.

Air mail: R2 (£1 or \$2.80 — Africa; R3.50 (£1.17.6 or \$5.00) — Overseas; £2 — United Kingdom.

Cheques and postal orders to be made payable to Pro Veritate (Pty.) Ltd., P.O. Box 31135, Braamfontein, Johannesburg.

PLEASE NOTE

The Editorial staff of Pro Veritate state herewith that they are not responsible for opinions and standpoints which appear in any article of this monthly other than those in the editorial and editorial statements.

PRO VERITATE appears on the 15th of every month.

(Price per single copy 10c).

Printed by Prompt Printing Co. (Pty.) Ltd., 11 Harris Street, Westgate, Johannesburg.

Political comment in this issue by Dr. B. Engelbrecht & Dr. W. B. de Villiers, both of Dunwell, 35, Jorissen Street, Braamfontein, Johannesburg.

CHRISTIAN MONTHLY FOR SOUTHERN AFRICA CHRISTELIKE MAANDBLAD VIR SUIDELIKE AFRIKA

IN THIS ISSUE...

- The Revd. Alan Butler, Anglican priest at Trinity Church, Gaborone, relates how ecumenism is being assisted by this ecumenical church. P. 4
- David Thomas of the Africa Enterprise team writes of Mission '70 — Johannesburg's ambitious urban mission project. P. 5
- Richard Turner, a lecturer in philosophy, discusses the relationship between religion and politics. P. 7
- Twelve statements for the consideration of all Christian voters in the Republic of South Africa. P. 8
- Bishop Colin Winter of Damaraland writes poignantly of his experiences with his people. P. 12
- Archbishop Helder Camara of Olinda and Recife, Brazil is internationally known for his struggle for social justice and his championing the Third World. He reveals the seven deadly sins of the modern world. P. 13
- Prof. B. B. Keet assesses Ian Paisley's rôle in the Northern Ireland conflict. P. 16
- Ds. C. F. B. Naudé pays tribute to our departing editor Dr. Ben Engelbrecht who has accepted a lectureship at the University of the Witwatersrand. P. 17

IN HIERDIE UITGAWE...

- Eerw. Alan Butler, Anglikaanse priester van die Trinity Church, Gaborone, vertel hoe die ekumenisme bevorder word deur dié ekumeniese kerk. Bl. 4
- David Thomas van die Africa Enterprise-span skryf oor Sending '70 — Johannesburg se ambisieuse stedelike sendingprojek. Bl. 5
- Richard Turner, 'n filosofie-dosent, bespreek die verhouding tussen die godsdiens en die politiek. Bl. 7
- Twaalf stelling vir oorweging deur alle stemgeregtigde Christene in die Republiek van Suid-Afrika. Bl. 9
- Biskop Colin Winter van Damaraland skryf roerend oor sy ervarings met sy kudde. Bl. 12
- Aartsbiskop Helder Camara van Olinda en Recife, Brasilië is internasionaal bekend vanweë sy stryd om maatskaplike geregtigheid en sy voorspraak vir die Derde Wêreld. Hy stel die sewe dood-sondes van die moderne wêreld aan die kaak. Bl. 13
- Prof. B. B. Keet begroot die rol van Ian Paisley in die Noord-Ierse konflik. Bl. 16
- Ds. C. F. B. Naudé bring hulde aan ons vertrekkende redakteur, dr. Ben Engelbrecht wat 'n lektoraat aan die Witwatersrandse Universiteit aanvaar het. Bl. 17

Editorial:

CHURCH AND POLITICS IN SOUTH AFRICA TODAY

It is necessary for the Christian Church in our country once again to give account to itself of what its relationship to politics ought to be. Furthermore, for the sake of the proper execution of their task, it is just as necessary that political parties, as well as the government, should once again give account to themselves of their proper relationship to the Church.

A lack of reflection and clarity on this extremely important question is undoubtedly the cause of much sickness and deformity and the cause of the hatred and intolerance which are so painfully characteristic of the South African ecclesiastical and political scene. It is certainly not far-fetched to allege that the questionable relationship between the Church and politics in our country is the cause of things having come to such a pass that a pseudo-Christian political party policy has developed into a national ideology which not only spells disaster for South Africa itself, but has also caused the whole Christian world to turn its back upon us in disgust.

A typical symptom of this unhealthy relationship is the phenomenon that two former ministers of the influential Nederduits Gereformeerde Kerk have, via the editorship of the official mouthpiece of this church, managed to have themselves installed as editors of party political newspapers, one of which has already become known for its extreme rightist tone whilst the other will probably outdo it in this respect. Whether these two papers, with ex-ministers in their editorial chairs, are going to oppose each other as mouthpieces of two bitterly antagonistic parties or whether, to the embarrassment of the political leaders, they are going to follow the same line remains to be seen. The fact remains, however, that these two men were committed to the church in such a way that they inevitably had to take up the positions they now hold. However unpleasant it may be for some members of the Nederduits Gereformeerde Kerk, it is symptomatic of the situation within this church itself. In addition, many other questionable matters can be raised, all of them connected with the fact that a large part of the church in our country identifies itself with a particular party political policy as closely as with the Gospel itself. This explains the hatred and intolerance towards all who refused to subscribe to the national policy being followed as a credo and to adhere to it as a gospel.

As regards the political party now in power, it has brought much harm upon our country by exploiting this situation to its own advantage. It is only with the backing of a mighty body such as the Nederduits Gereformeerde Kerk, for example, that the Prime Minister could again claim in his New Year's Message that opposition to the racial policy at present being followed in South Africa should not be seen as offence taken at the policy of a particular political party, but in fact at our fundamental philosophy of life and civilization. This is a church that, in its intimate alliance and entanglement with a political party, prompted this party in its belief that its policy was exclusively Christian and that everything contradicting it was unchristian, and that therefore paved the way for the political intolerance which has become more and more — and quite explicably in the light of circumstances — characteristic of the party. With the encouragement of the church, politics in South Africa is today practised in the delusion that the political leaders are charismatic saviours and that their policy is a divinely inspired doctrine of salvation. This is why it is so completely understandable that the worst fanatics of the party at a given moment severed relations in true sectarian fashion with the accusation that things were no longer proceeding purely enough along the "old paths" within the party and established their own "more Christian" party. It is also why it is so completely unthinkable for loyal adherents of the party that a "schism" should occur within the holy party. This explains the intense contempt and hatred towards the new group, and why "christian" and "christian" are so antagonistic towards each other — armed if necessary with the "armour" of their "good fight"; eggs and tomatoes. The one appeals more loudly to "God Our Father" than the other. And in this situation the mess of the party is, obviously, the mess of the church.

For its present and future salvation and welfare South Africa needs nothing so much as that politics should be brought down again to the earth where it belongs. It must be demythologised, de-demonised. An exorcism must take place. The divergence, with all its lamentable consequences for our country during the past twenty-two years, occurred when the National Party, backed by the mighty three Dutch Reformed Churches, began to believe and proclaim that it was called to bring about apartheid

between the races as the exclusive will of God in obedience to his commandment in our country. This is the delusion from which we must be liberated. And to be liberated from it, our country's politics needs that Christian witness which the church should offer it. The greatest service which the church in South Africa can offer our country is to set itself at a critical distance from the struggle between the parties and to rediscover itself as Church of Christ. To be sure, this does not mean that it should dissociate itself from politics as such or from the government. The church has an enormous responsibility with regard to politics and the State. It cannot fulfil this responsibility, however, if it allows itself to be divided along the lines of the political divisions in the country. As long as the political bone of contention of apartheid keeps the churches apart and prevents them from speaking unanimously, God's Name will continue to be desecrated on the ecclesiastical and political battlefield in the same way as in the past twenty-two years, and the future will remain dark and without prospect for South Africa.

It is necessary then, above all else, that the church should rediscover itself as a unique body, as the bearer of divine revelation, standing over against and distinct from the parties in the political struggle. It can then start fulfilling its political responsibility. To the government it must proclaim the liberating truth that its task is a merely **earthly** task and that it is only that government which sees its task as such that is "Christian". Its Christianity does not lie in calling upon the help of God against its critics

at all hours and in absolutising its policy with an appeal to God, but in dealing in a purely earthly fashion with the earthly things entrusted to its care. The concerns of politics are labour, bread, earthly security, order, safety, right and justice. Its concern should be that the country shall be a dwelling-place, a home for the whole people who dwell in it and that life shall be livable for them. The God of the Bible, whose servant the government is, is an earthly God. Politics is holy — not demonically charged! — because it is concerned with the earth and the earthly life which God loves. Therefore it must be "secularised".

This is the service the church in South Africa owes politics. Under no circumstances may the church identify itself with a political party. In the first place it must feel itself obliged to the government in power. It is only in the most extreme cases of political degeneration that the church may desire its downfall. The concern of the church must be that the ruling government shall rule well and that, inasmuch as it shows signs of degeneration, it shall become converted. Its instruction to, its criticism of and its intercession for the government must be so directed that it acts and governs in purely earthly matters according to the demands of truth, justice and love.

The present situation in South Africa, which no one of sound mind can call healthy and hopeful for the future, must be remedied. This can only happen if the relationship between the church and politics is placed on a sound footing.

B.E.

Inleidingsartikel:

KERK EN POLITIEK IN SUID-AFRIKA VANDAG

Dit is noodsaaklik dat die Christelike Kerk in ons land hom opnuut sal rekenskap gee van wat sy verhouding tot die politiek behoort te wees. Ter wille van die goeie uitvoering van hul taak is dit net so noodsaaklik dat politieke partye sowel as die owerheid hulle opnuut sal rekenskap gee van wat hulle verhouding tot die kerk behoort te wees.

Gebrek aan besinning en duidelikheid oor hierdie uiters belangrike kwessie is ongetwyfeld die oorsaak van baie van die sieklike en misvormdeheid, van die haat en die onverdraagsaamheid wat van die Suid-Afrikaanse kerklike en politieke toneel so pynlik kenmerkend is. Dit is gewis ook nie ver-

gesog om te beweer dat die bedenklike verhouding tussen die kerk en die politiek in ons land die oorsaak daarvan is dat dit so ver kon kom dat 'n pseudo-Christelike politieke party-beleid in 'n landsideologie ontwikkel het wat nie slegs vir Suid-Afrika self heilloos is nie, maar wat ook die ganse Christelike wêreld hom met weersin van ons laat afkeer nie.

'n Tipiese simptome van hierdie ongesonde verhouding is die verskynsel dat twee voormalige predikante van die invloedryke Ned. Geref. Kerk via die redakteurskap van die amptelike orgaan van dié Kerk hulle weg gevind het na die redakteur-

skap van party-politieke koerante waarvan die een reeds bekendheid verwerf het vir sy ekstremisties regse inslag, terwyl die ander hom waarskynlik daarin sal oortref. Of hierdie twee koerante, met oud-predikante in hul redakteurstoele, as mondstukke van twee bitter vyandiggesinde partye mekaar gaan opponeer of, tot verleentheid van die politieke base, mekaar na die mond gaan spreek, staan nog te besien. Feit is egter dat die pad vir hierdie twee persone reg deur die kerk geloop het en ipso facto moes uitloop op die posisies wat hulle tans beklee. Hoe onaangenaam dit ook al vir sommige in die Ned. Geref. Kerk mag wees, dit is simptomaties van 'n toestand in dié Kerk self. Daarby kan nog baie ander bedenklikhede genoem word wat alles saamhang met die feit dat 'n groot deel van die kerk in ons land hom met 'n bepaalde party-politieke beleid vereenselwig het soos met die evangelie self. Daaruit veral moet die haat en die onverdraagsaamheid verklaar word teenoor almal wat die landsbeleid wat gevolg is, nie as 'n geloofsbelydenis wou onderskryf en as 'n evangelie wou aanhang nie.

Wat betref die politieke party wat tans aan bewind is, vir ons land het hy veel kwaads op die hals gehaal deur hierdie situasie tot sy eie voordeel terdeë uit te buit. Dit is slegs met die rugsteun van 'n magtige liggaam soos die Ned. Geref. Kerk dat die Eerste Minister, bv., in sy Nuwejaarsboodskap weer daarop kon aanspraak maak dat teenstand teen die rassebeleid wat tans in Suid-Afrika gevolg word, nie gesien moet word as aanstoot wat geneem word aan die beleid van 'n besondere politieke party nie, maar wel aan ons fundamentele lewenshouding en beskawing. Dit is 'n kerk wat, in sy innige verbondenheid en verweefdheid met 'n politieke party, dié party daarin voorgepraat het dat sy beleid eksklusief Christelik is en dat al wat dit weerspreek onchristelik is, en wat daarom die weg gebaan het vir die politieke intoleransie wat meer en meer — en in die lig van die omstandighede, volkome verklaarbaar — van die party kenmerkend geword het. Onder aanvuring van die kerk word politiek vandag in Suid-Afrika bedryf in die waan dat die politieke aanvoeders charismatiese heilsfigure is en dat hulle beleid 'n goddelik geïnspireerde heilsleer is. Daarom is dit ener syds so volkome verstaanbaar dat die ergste fanatici van die party op 'n gegewe tydstip op 'n eg sektariese wyse weggebreek het met die beskuldiging dat dit daarbinne nie meer suiwer genoeg volgens die „ou paaie“ gaan nie, en 'n eie, „Christeliker“ party gestig het, en andersyds vir die lojale party-aanbidders so gans ondenkbaar dat daar in die heilige party 'n skeuring“ sou kom. Daarom die intense veragting en haat teenoor die nuwe groep, en staan „Christen“ en „Christen“ so bitter venynig teenoor mekaar — desnoods gewapen met die „wapens“ van hul „goeie stryd“: eiers en tamaties. Die een beroep hom harder op „God Onse Vader“ as die ander. En in hierdie situasie is die gemors

van die party onontkombaar vanselfsprekend die gemors van die kerk.

Suid-Afrika het vir sy heil en welsyn in die hede en in die toekoms niks so nodig nie as dat die politiek wat in hom bedryf word, weer versaklik sal word, soos dit hoort. Dit moet ge-ontmitologiseer, ge-ontdemoniseer word. Daar moet 'n exorcisme plaasvind. Die fatale ontsporing, met al die betreuenwaardige gevolge daarvan vir ons land gedurende die afgelope 22 jaar, het gekom toe die Nasionale Party, gerugsteun deur die magtige drie Afrikaans-Hollandse kerke, begin glo en verkondig het dat hy geroep is om apartheid tussen die rasse as die uitsluitlike wil van God in gehoorsaamheid aan sy gebod in ons land te bewerkstellig. Dit is die waan waarvan ons bevry moet word. En om daarvan bevry te word, het ons landspolitiek die Christelike getuienis, soos die kerk dit behoort te lewer, nodig. Die grootste diens wat die kerk in Suid-Afrika aan ons land kan bewys, is om homself op 'n kritiese afstand van die partye-stryd te stel en hom as Kerk van Christus te hervind. Dit beteken weliswaar nie dat hy hom aan die politiek as sodanig en aan die owerheid moet onttrek nie. Die kerk het 'n enorme verantwoordelikheid ten opsigte van die staat en die politiek. Hy kan hierdie verantwoordelikheid egter nie nakom as hy homself laat verdeel volgens die politieke verdeeldheid wat daar in die land bestaan nie. So lank as wat die politieke twisappel van die verfoeilike apartheid die kerke uitmekaar hou en verhinder om uit een mond te spreek, sal Gods Naam op die kerklik-politieke strydtoneel in ons land so gruwelik onheilig word soos gedurende die afgelope 22 jaar, en sal die toekoms vir Suid-Afrika donker en vooruitsigloos bly.

Dit is dus allereers nodig, nl. dat die kerk hom as 'n eie, unieke instansie, as draer van die Godsopenbaring, teenoor en los van die partye in die politieke stryd, sal herontdek. Dan kan hy sy politieke verantwoordelikheid begin nakom. Aan die owerheid moet hy die bevrydende waarheid verkondig dat sy taak 'n bloot **aardse** taak is en dat juis die owerheid wat sy taak só sien, nl. as 'n inrigting en ordening van die aardse lewe, „Christelik“ is. Nie dáárin lê sy Christelikheid dat hy tydig en ontydig die hulp van God teen sy kritici inroep en sy beleid met 'n beroep op God verabsoluteer nie, maar daarin dat hy op 'n suiwer wêreldse wyse met die wêreldse dinge wat aan hom toevertrou is, sal omgaan. Dit gaan in die politiek om arbeid, om brood, om aardse sekuriteit, om orde, om veiligheid, om reg en geregtigheid. Dit gaan daarom dat die land vir die ganse volk wat dit bewoon, 'n woonplek, 'n tuiste sal wees en dat die lewe vir hulle leefbaar sal wees. Die God van die Bybel, wie se dienaar die owerheid is, is 'n aardse God. Die politiek is heilig — nie demonies gelade nie! — omdat dit daarin om die aarde en die aardse lewe gaan wat God liefhet. Daarom moet dit „gesekulariseer“ word.

Hierdie diens is die kerk in Suid-Afrika aan die politiek verskuldig. Die kerk mag hom onder geen omstandighede met 'n politieke party vereenselwig nie. Hy moet hom in die eerste instansie verplig voel teenoor die owerheid wat regeer. Dit is slegs in die uiterste gevalle van politieke ontarding dat die kerk hom teen die owerheid mag rig en sy ontseteling mag begeer. Dit moet vir die kerk dáárom gaan dat die owerheid wat regeer, goed sal regeer en dat, vir sover hy tekens van ontarding toon, hy hom sal bekeer. Sy voorligting aan, sy kritiek op en sy voorbidding vir die owerheid moet dáárop

gerig wees dat die owerheid in die suiwer aardse, saaklike dinge, sal handel en regeer volgens die eise van die waarheid, die geregtigheid en die liefde.

Die toestand in Suid-Afrika tans, wat niemand wat by sy volle verstand is as gesond en daarom hoopvol vir die toekoms sal bestempel nie, moet verhelp word. Dit kan alleen gebeur as die verhouding tussen die kerk en die politiek op 'n suiwer grondslag gestel word.

B.E.

UNITED SCHEME IN GABORONE

A Welcome Contrast

— THE REV. ALAN BUTLER

Gaborone, or Gaborone as it used to be spelt, was built in a hurry. In 1960 the Bechuanaland Protectorate had no political parties and was content to be ruled from Mafeking, by 1966 she had a brand new capital and was an independent state.

When the capital was at the planning stage the different denominations were invited to apply for church sites and it was only after they had hurriedly done so that some leaders began to call for cooperation.

TRADITIONS SURVIVED

Many traditions survived longer in the B.P. than they did in other parts of Southern Africa, one of them was comity of missions. The older churches of the Protectorate, the Congregationalists (who outnumber all the others put together), the Lutherans and the Dutch Reformed, established themselves in the tribal centres over a hundred years ago. They respected each other's territory in a friendly way, but had little contact with each other. The Anglicans, and the Roman Catholics who came much later, were mainly confined to the line of rail and were not allowed by the chiefs to enter any of the tribal areas until years afterwards. The chiefs of the Bakgatla and the Bangwaketse would only allow one church in their areas until Independence gave freedom of religion under a new constitution.

The lack of contact due to history and distance, and the fact that all the

churches had their denominational centres outside Bechuanaland, meant that the ecumenical movement had made little impact. The challenge of a new situation at Gaborone was one of the first that made the churches cooperate.

Gaborone was built on the eve of Independence and from the beginning was a symbol of the new nation's determination to overcome divisions and find the unity that is essential to political and economic progress. It became clear to some church leaders that they had a duty to help this process for theological as well as social reasons. So in 1964, when the capital was already under construction, a series of meetings was called in Gaborone. The Congregational Church took the initiative and official representatives of the Anglican, Methodist and Presbyterian Churches attended, as well as members of the local Society of Friends. The result was agreement to establish a joint ministry in the capital. A local union of the Presbyterian, Methodist and Congregational Churches and of the Friends was formed with the Rev. J. D. Jones as minister, and this Union Congregation and the local Anglican Parish planned the erection of a single church building and covenanted

to worship and work together in the new town.

DENOMINATIONAL INTEREST

In the early stages several other denominations showed interest in the scheme but drew back explaining that their ordinary church members were not ready for it. There is little doubt that this was also true of the ordinary membership of the participating churches themselves, but experience has shown that people respond to leadership and the official decisions of the various synods and conferences were accepted by almost all their members as they came to live in Gaborone.

After the two congregations had set up their own Church Council and Court of Elders, they elected local trustees who raised funds for the new church and contacted overseas donors through the World Council of Churches. By Independence, in September 1966, two houses had been built for the ministers and in the same year Trinity Church was opened in the presence of the President, Sir Seretse Khama.

For five years now the two congregations have worked very closely together, meeting separately on Sunday mornings according to their traditions, but maintaining a joint Sunday School and gathering each Sunday

evening for united worship. Extension work and witness in the Youth Club, prison etc., have been carried out on a united basis and Trinity Church has become a rallying point for many kinds of social service in the town. During 1969 the Anglicans were given permission by their church to take part in joint Communion Services on certain specially arranged occasions and this has led to a deepening of fellowship between the two units of Trinity Church.

The big Congregational Church in Botswana is nearly entirely African while the membership of the Presbyterian Church in the country is totally European. One consequence of the scheme is that real collaboration between the races has been possible in a church-setting for members of these two denominations. Anglican membership is divided equally between the races but a very high proportion of it is foreign, whatever the Anglicans' colour. The scheme of cooperation with a predominantly Botswana Union Church helps Anglicans cross the boundaries of nationalism in their worship.

EXCLUSIVE MEMBERSHIP

With comity of missions, some of the denominations have memberships

drawn exclusively from one tribe and this has weakened the Church's influences for good in the important struggle against tribalism. Cooperation at Trinity has enabled many Christians who would otherwise be segregated in this way to make their witness for national as well as Christian unity.

It is sad therefore that more churches have not yet been able to join the scheme and Gaborone now finds itself with four other church buildings besides Trinity. When the most recent was opened a local magazine said 'the magnificent building with its steep roof and tower is a welcome addition to the contrasting church architecture in Gaborone'. It is a pity to have this sort of contrast for the United Scheme is a deliberate attempt to express Christian unity without insisting on uniformity, and the commitment to the use of a single building has been a valuable help to those who use it and also an example to others of the meaning of their common faith.

Buildings have a special importance in a new country. They express national aspirations and rightly or wrongly condition subsequent development. Those who planned together at Trinity Church felt that separate buildings would be concrete examples of Chris-

tian disunity and a denial of the Gospel's ability to reconcile men; half a dozen more little churches would also make subsequent reunion just a little harder to achieve. In Africa in the 60's and 70's it seems right to plan everything on the supposition that the churches will unite sooner or later!

INEVITABLE MISTAKES

But inevitably mistakes have been made and some features of the scheme might have been arranged differently so a meeting of all the churches now established in Gaborone was held recently. It attempted to evaluate the effect of the United Scheme. A few were critical of it. Some said it did not make much difference to them; but the Lutheran minister said that he felt every congregation appreciated that something was being attempted that was good. His denomination has not joined and is building its own church but we have a closer relationship with them and with all the churches of the town simply because they know that Trinity Church stands for cooperation.

This new understanding is a real step forward and in contrast to old attitudes in Botswana. Perhaps next time the churches will get started earlier and more of them will be able to take part.

MISSION TO A METROPOLIS

— DAVID THOMAS

"It's only when you stand outside the parish situation that you begin to realise what the Church is NOT doing." The speaker was Dr. Calvin Cook, who for five years has lived in Johannesburg as a university lecturer and an ordinary lay member. Before that, he was a Presbyterian minister, but as he says, his five years of laymanship really opened his eyes to the shortcomings of the Church, and churches, in Johannesburg.

It was this realisation which prompted Dr. Cook, and two other ministers, to invite the Africa Enterprise team to organise a city-wide mission in Johannesburg in 1970 — Mission '70. The Africa Enterprise (AE) team, which is based in Pietermaritzburg, is not just one more mission organisation. It is a group of young men with some revolutionary ideas about urban mission — ideas

which they had already demonstrated in a mission to Wits University in 1967.

SOMETHING REVOLUTIONARY

Johannesburg Christians undoubtedly need something revolutionary to start them acting as the Church should act in Johannesburg. Not that the churches are weak and declining.

Many are vigorous and steadily growing. The trouble is (a) that they tend to move in watertight compartments and (b) that they tend to be timid and inward looking. Thus one finds that the Christian Church just does not rank as an important factor in the life of Johannesburg.

This is quite amazing when one considers that out of a population of slightly more than 400,000, over 200,000 are on church membership rolls. The corresponding figures for the non-white population are harder to pin down, but it can be confidently estimated that at least a third of all non-whites in Johannesburg are on church rolls.

Here is tremendous potential power. But for the most part it lies dormant. One reason is the division among churches. Each denomination, concerned with its own denominational affairs, sees only its own small numerical strength in the city. Christians as a whole are quite unaware of how powerful a group they form. Another reason for the failure of the churches to exploit their potential is that by and large, they are obsessed with the idea of professional Christians. The life of the churches revolves around the clergy, while the laity are seen as helpless amateurs, who have little to do beyond sitting in church receiving spiritual spoon feeding from the professionals.

AFRICA ENTERPRISE

The men of Africa Enterprise, and indeed all intelligent Christians, see that this is an inversion of what the true position in the Church should be. The clergy should not form the spearhead of the Church; that according to the New Testament pattern, is the job of the laity. And thus Mission '70 adds up to a gigantic effort to mobilise the laity of the churches, and so to point the way to the true nature of the Church.

Mission '70 represents a radical departure from the usual pattern of evangelism. It will **not** employ professionals to carry the Gospel to Johannesburg. No world renowned figures will be invited to address vast gatherings of people in enormous stadia. Instead, its main thrust will be evident in small groups of laymen gathering in homes throughout the suburbs and in offices in the city centre. And the people running these groups will not be professional clergy either. They will be ordinary lay members from the churches.

BOEKBESPREKING:

'N BELANGRIKE PUBLIKASIE VIR ONS TYD

Inklusief Denken

Die Christelike Instituut het 'n beperkte voorraad van die Nederlandse teoloog, *dr. F. Boerwinkel*, se boek, *Inklusief Denken*, teen 60c per eksemplaar (posvry).

In hierdie boek wat nou al sy elfde druk beleef, word aan die hand van

This concept of lay involvement is basic to Mission '70. The AE team only comes into the picture as organisational backroom boys providing expertise and know-how for local churches and Christians, who will themselves be carrying out the mission.

The ramifications of the Mission which rise above this foundation are many and varied, and do not need detailing here. Yet it can be pointed out that using the concept of lay involvement, the Mission will have a two pronged thrust.

PENETRATION

First, the Mission will seek to penetrate specialised areas of Johannesburg's life. Thus special committees will have the responsibility of penetrating the business world, the immigrant community, Hillbrow and flatland, the sporting community, the world of domestic servants, schools and hospitals among others. The idea is to touch as much of Johannesburg's life as possible, and of course, also that of Soweto and the Coloured and Asiatic communities. This concept of reaching out to all strata of the city's life is summed up in the term "Stratified Mission", coined by AE.

Secondly, Mission '70 will attempt to penetrate suburbia by means of home discussion groups. Special training, also done in groups, will be provided for the laity of the churches, the idea being that they will then invite their friends and neighbours into their homes for discussion and teaching of the Christian message.

The training to be provided forms a significant aspect of the Mission. For it means that Mission '70 will not be a fly-by-night affair, but it will leave behind it a solid core of trained laymen in the churches. And so, as Dr.

Calvin Cook has observed, the important thing about Mission '70 is not only what it will accomplish, but what it will begin.

HIGHLY SIGNIFICANT

It could also begin a highly significant ecumenical movement in Johannesburg. Already well over half the individual parishes in Johannesburg are involved, and more will become so. This means that for a period of nearly a year, a wide spectrum of Christian denominations will be involved in the working together in the same project. And when churches start working together, unity very often follows as a matter of course.

Even before it has begun, the Mission has met with a remarkable response, and has had a remarkable number of doors opened to it. For instance, it seemed that its requirements for a headquarters were quite impossible to fulfil. A large building with a good number of rooms which could be used was needed, together with ample parking space in a fairly central area. To anyone familiar with the accommodation position near the centre of Johannesburg, that seemed almost laughable. Yet a chance remark at a prayer meeting led to the Mission acquiring the old German School in Hillbrow which has (a) any number of classrooms available for offices; (b) a large playground available for parking and (c) is situated as near the heart of Johannesburg as could be desired. And all for what seems a ridiculously low rental!

Pointers such as these seem to indicate something momentous happening in Johannesburg in 1970. Indeed, the success or failure of Mission '70 may well have significant repercussions on the whole Church in Southern Africa.

presiese gegewens en met behulp van grafieke aangetoon dat die verandering in ons tyd die karakter dra, nie van 'n stroomversnelling nie, maar van 'n waterval! Dit eis 'n nuwe manier van denke en handel. Die oue denke was oorheersend antagonisties en eksklusief, waarby die teenstellings die meeste op die voorgrond getree het en beslissend was. Die totaal nuwe situasie waarin ons nou leef, vra 'n inklusief denke, d.w.s. 'n denke wat prinsipiël daarvan uitgaan

dat my heil (geluk, lewe, welvaart) nie verkry word ten koste van of sonder die ander nie, maar alleen as die mens tegelyk die heil van die ander beoog en bevorder. Vanuit baie terreine van die praktiese lewe word hierdie opvatting in die boek belig.

'n Prikkelende boek inderdaad. Bestel u eksemplaar onmiddellik by Die Christelike Instituut, Posbus 31134, Braamfontein, Transvaal (60c posvry; tjeks, ens. aan Die Christelike Instituut).

THE CHRISTIAN AND POLITICS

— R. TURNER

There is a widespread popular belief that “religion and politics don’t mix”, or that “the Church should keep out of politics”. The historical origins of this belief are clear: firstly the struggle of the nation state to free itself from the dual control of people and emperor, together with the wresting of territory from the direct administrative control of abbots and bishops in some areas; and secondly, the general divorce between the personal sphere and the public sphere which accompanied the rise of capitalism and of the “protestant ethic”. Religious and moral questions become strictly limited to the personal sphere, and outside this sphere, in his economic or political activities, the individual is seen as being obliged to submit himself to the patterns and norms of his society. That is, the ideological justification for the split between morality and politics lies in the assumption that a certain form of society is natural, and quite independent of the individuals in it. Just as it would be ridiculous for the Church to debate whether or not you should obey the law of gravity, so it would be ridiculous for the Church to debate whether or not you should obey the laws defining “success” and the way to achieve it, in a capitalist society.

SOCIETY

In the medieval period society was seen as a personal hierarchy, and one’s position in it, one’s rights and one’s duties, were defined in terms of specific relations to other specific individuals. In the capitalist period, however, society is seen as an impersonal entity, and what happens in it is blamed on impersonal forces — in particular, on “the market”. This position reaches its apogee in nineteenth century laissezfaire liberalism, in which the individual becomes a purely mechanical object which reacts automatically to a given situation in terms of material self-interest, and it becomes not only silly, but downright immoral, to try to interfere with the “natural order”. Ethical questions involve only the way in which you should treat people in private and personal relationships, and not your public relationships; employer-employee, tradesman-customer, commander-commanded.

This distinction between the natural, amoral, public domain, and the private, free, moral domain, between religion and politics, was, of course, not always so clearly enunciated or justified as this. Rather, there grew up within the Church a general unwillingness to talk about politics, and

among politicians a general suspicion of clerics who did.

But SHOULD Christian churches involve themselves in politics? That is the wrong question to start off with, for first we have to ask “CAN a Christian church in fact divorce itself from politics?”

MORAL PRECEPT

The basic Christian moral precept is “Love your neighbour”. Many moralists seem to think that they can stop moralising as soon as they have enunciated this precept, or at least, as soon as they have proved it. They assume that once you know that you should love your neighbour, you will have no trouble acting correctly in particular situations.

But in fact, once you know that you should love your neighbour you are only at the very beginning of moral theory. Leaving aside the problems of individual psychology involved in deciding what factors make it possible for an individual to be capable of loving at all, there remain a number of complex difficulties. In order to know how best to express my love for my neighbour I must know

(a) the nature of my present relationship to him — the extent to

which I am factually responsible for his situation;

- (b) the exact nature of his situation;
 (c) the reasons why his situation could be changed.

Let me illustrate this with a simple uncontroversial example from nineteenth century England. Let us say you are a good church-going factory owner. In a slump, you have to lay off half of your employees, who are also your neighbours. How should you set about expressing your love for them? What you do, assuming, of course, that you are acting in good faith, will depend on how you understand the situation. Why are the workers out of work? It is easy to see that it is because the country is in the middle of an economic depression. But why is there a depression? There are two kinds of answers, and your behaviour will depend on the kind that you give. Your analysis of society may lead you to conclude, as did the bulk of 19c thinkers, that slumps are caused by the inevitable working of a natural economic system over which you have no control. In this case your love will take the form of woolly socks and hot soup once a day. On the other hand your analysis of society and the social structure may lead you to conclude that the economic system is not natural and inevitable at all, that slumps are the result of a man-made political system, for which you, as a factory owner, are very much responsible, and which could be other than it is. In this case, your love would take the form of combining with your neighbour in order to overthrow the system and to replace it with a new, more rational and human one.

YOUR NEIGHBOUR

To love your neighbour you have to know who or what is responsible for his suffering, and how it could
 (Contd. on page 10)

For a long time now, an awareness has been growing among a large number of Christians that something must be **done**, especially in the **political** field, to counter the deteriorating human relations in our country. The voting public of South Africa in general — which so often prides itself as being Christian — and specifically the responsibility that the Christian as citizen carries, need to be con-

fronted by way of a clear Christian witness with the real demands of Christian responsibility. The following manifesto, which is being made public during the week-end of 17th—18th January, 1970 was drawn up with a view to the impending General Election. It is a first step in this direction.

Twelve Statements for the Consideration of All Christian Voters in the Republic of South Africa

1. Every Christian has an inescapable political responsibility, especially he who has the vote.
 2. Politics concerns itself with the arrangement of society and therefore most intimately affects the lives of people created in the image of God.
 3. It is the Christian's duty to contribute by his vote towards the establishment of a government which shall promote law and order, and shall work for the welfare of the whole community over which it is appointed, in accordance with the Biblical commandments of truth, justice and love.
 4. Any arrangement of a people's life which is not in accordance with the commandments of truth, justice and love opposes the common good, endangers law and order, conflicts with the will of God and therefore leads to the downfall of such a people.
 5. In His acts of creation and of salvation, God reveals that He is deeply concerned about human society as well as about the life and fate of every individual. This is why the Christian recognises the intrinsic value of society and the dignity of every individual.
 6. The Christian shares in the responsibility for the arrangement of society in accordance with the revealed commandments and promises of God. Hence, in his political witness and action, he should be obedient to the revealed will of God and reject anything which conflicts with it.
 7. Every Christian must, therefore, give account to God concerning his giving or withholding of support for any particular political party and its policy. He should test his own participation in politics by the following basic standards.
 8. **RECONCILIATION.** In obedience to God, no Christian can support a political policy which is based on an unjust discrimination, on arbitrary grounds of colour, race, religion or sex, between people who live and work in the same country. He must further reject such a policy of discrimination when it leads to a consistent enforced separation of such people without their common consent. Man's sinful urge towards discrimination and separation stands in direct conflict with the Bible's message of reconciliation.
 9. **TRUTH.** In obedience to God, no Christian can support a political policy which, being demonstrably impracticable, bases its appeal to the electorate on false claims and promises. Such an essentially dishonest policy cannot be reconciled with the Christian's commitment to the truth.
 10. **JUSTICE.** In obedience to God, no Christian can support a political policy which, for its practical implementation, unavoidably necessitates open or concealed injustice towards any individual or population group. A policy which essentially diminishes, offends or injures the human dignity of any citizen, must be totally rejected by the Christian.
 11. **LOVE.** In obedience to God, no Christian can support a political policy which is essentially based on group selfishness and the furtherance of sectional interests only. Such a policy leads to inhumanity and lovelessness and must consequently clash with the law of love given by Christ.
 12. It is the Christian's grave duty and responsibility thoroughly to examine the policy of every political party in South Africa and to acquaint himself with its implications. He must weigh all political utterances and policies against the truth of God. In so doing, he may find that no available political policy represents complete obedience to this truth; he will nevertheless be obliged, in making his judgment, to approach as closely as possible to a complete obedience.
- The Christian who has the vote must guard against the temptation to make decisions based on personal or group selfishness. His responsibility becomes even greater in a society where a small minority of citizens elect the members of the central parliament.
- In short, the Christian's participation in politics must be determined by his inescapable responsibility towards God and his neighbour.

ONDERTEKENAARS/SIGNATORIES:

The Rev. R. D. Adendorff, Mr. R. H. Aitchison, Vr. Lewis Balink, The Rev. Douglas S. Bax, The Rev. Francois Bill, The Rev. Alex Boraine, The Rev. G. D. Brayshaw, Dr. E. H. Brookes, Br. Mark Collier, O.P., Fr. C. Collins, The Rev. D. L. Crawford, The Rev. Duncan S. Davidson, The Rev. John D. Davies, The Rev. Colin Davison, The Rev. J. W. de Gruchy, Dr. W. B. de Villiers, The Rev. R. D. Donaldson, Vr. A. Eggenhuizen, O.P., The Rev. R. Ellis, Dr. Ben Engelbrecht, Mr. R. Falkenberg, The Very Rev. G. A. French-Beytagh, Mr. Colin Gardner, Mnr. J. Griffioen, Mr. C. E. W. Henderson, Mrs. M. H. Henderson, Prof. A. M. Hugo, The Rev. David L. Jones, The Very Rev. Msgr. A. D. Kelly, Prof. B. B. Keet, Mr. R. U. Kenney, The Very Rev. E. L. King, The Rt. Rev. E. G. Knapp-Fisher, The Rev. Theo Kotze, Fr. Victor Kotze, The Rev. J. V. Leatt, Prof. I. D. MacCrone,

Onder 'n groot aantal bekommerde Suid-Afrikaanse Christene bestaan daar vir 'n geruime tyd al die kwellende besef dat daar — ook en veral op politieke gebied — iets **gedoen** moet word omtrent die verslegtende menseverhoudinge in ons land. Veral is daar gevoel dat die stemgeregtigde volk van Suid-Afrika, wat hom so dikwels beroem op sy eie Christelikheid, by wyse van 'n duidelike Christe-

like getuienis gekonfronteer moet word met die werklike eise van die Christelike verantwoordelikheid, spesifiek dan ook van die Christen as landsburger. Die hieropvolgende manifes, wat oor die naweek van 17—18 Januarie, 1970 wêreldkundig gemaak word en wat opgestel is met die oog op die komende Algemene Verkiesing, is 'n eerste stap in dié rigting.

Twaalf Stellinge vir Oorweging deur alle Stemgeregtigde Christene in die Republiek van Suid-Afrika

1. Elke Christen het 'n onontwykbare politieke verantwoordelikheid, veral hy wat stemgeregtig is.
2. Die politiek hou hom besig met die inrigting van die samelewing en affekteer daarom die lewens van mense, geskape na die beeld van God, ten diepste.
3. Dit is die Christen se plig om deur sy stem by te dra tot die instelling van 'n landsregering wat wet en orde sal handhaaf en die belange en welvaart van die hele samelewing waarvoor hy aangestel is, sal bevorder ooreenkomstig die Bybelse gebooe van waarheid, geregtigheid en liefde.
4. Enige inrigting van die volkslewe wat nie geskied volgens die eise van waarheid, geregtigheid en liefde nie, benadeel die algemene welsyn, bedreig wet en orde, is strydig met die wil van God en moet daarom uitloop op die ondergang van so 'n volk.
5. In sy skeppingsdaad en in sy verlossingsdaad openbaar God dat Hy besorg is sowel oor die menslike gemeenskap as oor die lewe en lotgevalle van elke enkeling. Hieraan is die intrinsieke waarde wat die Christen aan die gemeenskap en aan die waardigheid van elke individu heg, te danke.
6. Die Christen is mede-verantwoordelik vir die inrigting van die samelewing ooreenkomstig die geopenbaarde gebooe en beloftes van God. Daarom moet hy in sy politieke getuienis en optrede aan die geopenbaarde wil van God gehoorsaam wees, en verwerp wat daarteen stry.
7. Elke Christen moet dus aan God verantwoording doen wat betref sy ondersteuning al dan nie van enige besondere politieke party en sy beleid. Hy moet sy eie deelname aan die politiek toets aan die volgende basiese vereistes.
8. **VERSOENING.** In gehoorsaamheid aan God kan geen Christen 'n politieke beleid ondersteun wat gebaseer is op 'n willekeurige en onregverdige diskriminasie tussen mense wat dieselfde land bewoon en bewerk, op grond van kleur, ras, godsdiens of geslag alleen nie. So 'n beleid van diskriminasie moet voorts ook deur hom verwerp word as dit lei tot 'n konsekwente gedwonge skeiding van sulke mense sonder hulle algemene toestemming. Die mens se sondige drang tot diskriminasie en skeiding druis lynreg in teen die versoeningsboodskap van die Bybel.
9. **WAARHEID.** In gehoorsaamheid aan God kan geen Christen 'n politieke beleid ondersteun wat, terwyl dit klaarblyklik prakties onuitvoerbaar is, sy beroep op die kiesers op valse aansprake en beloftes baseer nie. So 'n wesenlik oneerlike beleid kan nie met die Christen se verbintenis tot die waarheid versoen word nie.
10. **GEREGTIGHEID.** In gehoorsaamheid aan God kan geen Christen 'n politieke beleid ondersteun wat vir sy toepassing in die praktyk onvermydelik openlike of bedekte onreg teenoor enige individu of bevolkingsgroep veroorsaak nie. 'n Beleid waarvan dit wesenlik is dat dit die menswaardigheid van enige landsburger aantast, krenk of skaad, moet vir die Christen in sy geheel verwerplik wees.
11. **LIEFDE.** In gehoorsaamheid aan God kan geen Christen 'n politieke beleid ondersteun wat in sy wese op groepsselfsug berus en die eensydige bevordering van seksionele belange beoog nie. So 'n beleid moet onvermydelik gepaard gaan met die beoefening van gevoelloosheid en liefdeloosheid en moet gevolglik indruis teen die liefdeswet wat Christus gegee het.
12. Dit is die Christen se dure plig en verantwoordelikheid om die beleid van elke politieke party in Suid-Afrika deeglik te ondersoek en hom van die praktiese implikasies daarvan te vergewis. Hy moet alle politieke uitsprake en beleidsrigtings toets aan die waarheid van God. Hierin mag hy vind dat geen beskikbare politieke beleid volkome gehoorsaamheid aan hierdie waarheid verteenwoordig nie; in die bereiking van sy oordeel sal hy nietemin verplig wees om so na aan volkome gehoorsaamheid as moontlik te kom.

Die stemgeregtigde Christen moet daarteen waak dat hy hom nie laat meevoer tot 'n terugval op beslissinge wat op persoonlike of groepsselfsug berus nie. Sy verantwoordelikheid word des te groter in 'n politieke samelewing waar die lede van die sentrale parlement deur 'n klein minderheid burgers verkies word.

Die Christen se deelname aan die politiek moet, op stuk van sake, bepaal word deur sy onontkombare verantwoordelikheid teenoor God en sy naaste.

Dr. E. G. Malherbe, Mrs. Margaret Malherbe, The Rev. Cedric R. Mayson, Mr. Donald Molteno, Q.C., The Rev. Basil Moore, Eerw. D. G. Muller, Ds. C. F. B. Naudé, Mev. I. H. Naudé, The Very Rev. Mark Nye, Mrs. Joan O'Leary, The Rev. Robert Orr, The Rev. E. A. Perkins, Mr. Peter Randall, Prof. J. V. O. Reid, The Rev. R. J. D. Robertson, Mr. J. Hamilton Russell, The Rt. Rev. P. W. R. Russell, Fr. Jerome Smith, O.P., The Rev. P. J. Storey, The Rev. Arthur W. Stops, Ds. J. A. Swanepoel, Fr. Finbar Synnott, O.P., The Most Rev. Robert S. Taylor, Mr. J. A. G. Turner, The Rev. G. W. Underwood, Mnr. F. J. van Wyk, Ds. Danie van Zyl, The Rev. K. A. Wardle, Mr. Martin West, Dr. M. G. Whisson, The Rev. Dale White, Dr. Francis Wilson, The Rev. Colin Winter, Mr. D. Yates.

(Contd. from page 7)

be alleviated, and this means that you need a theory of politics. Otherwise you will just go along with the assumptions and limitations imposed by your society, and you may turn out to have been slowly murdering your neighbour, rather than loving him.

Christianity contains and implies no particular political theory, and yet until its ethical precepts are allied with a thought-out political theory it may remain impotent or even be downright dangerous.

The key point here is that it is not a question of whether or not it is **DESIRABLE** to have a political theory. The point is that it is impossible not to have an implicit or explicit political theory. The man who distributes hot soup to the poor is "ideologising" about his society just as much as is the revolutionary who wants to change it. Both are making assumptions about ends, about the nature of present society, and about the potential for change contained within it. Moreover, the person who doesn't even distribute soup to the poor is also "involved in politics", and is also "ideologising". All his actions towards other people — and even spending your whole life in a cave is a way of relating to other people — express certain assumptions about society. I don't just mean that he uses conventional styles of speaking and of greeting, that he has a social pecking order and so on. I mean that he assumes that the master-servant or capitalist-worker or peasant-trader relationship, in the form in which they find expression in his particular society, are **NATURAL** relationships, and so he accepts them and acts them out. And of course in acting them out he is **CREATING** these social relationships, and so **CREATING** a certain political structure.

SOCIAL INSTITUTIONS

There is no such thing as a **NATURAL** social order — tribalism, feudalism, capitalism, socialism, none of these forms of social organisation are natural in the way that, say, the beehive is natural to bees. The social institutions are created by the way in which men behave in that particular society. For example, the social institution "private property", say, owning a piece of land, is simply the **ACTIVITY** of keeping other people off it and keeping its produce my-

self. Of course this sort of activity has been institutionalised in laws, but these laws are man-made, and only mean anything in so far as people live the laws. I could behave towards the piece of land in quite a different way perhaps encouraging other people to come and enjoy it, or else giving away all its produce apart from my basic needs. It is **POSSIBLE** to behave like this, and obviously if everybody did we would have an entirely different type of society.

So people create social institutions by their own actions. On the other hand, it is obvious that they don't create them consciously and intentionally, or at least that they don't always do so. They start their lives in a particular historical situation, they learn ways of behaving from other people in their society. Although they may adjust their behaviour patterns to suit changes in society, nevertheless they need not be consciously aware of the nature of these changes and of the extent to which their previous historical conditioning makes their new attitudes irrational in terms of their real needs, and in terms of the new possibilities such as those created by the technological revolution of the last century, which has placed within our reach a solution to the problem of poverty and violence, but a solution which our political structures and attitudes cannot yet handle. Apart from the fact that our political attitudes have historical roots which often falsify them, there is also the problem that we do not, of course, create our society individually, we create it collectively. It is not just my behaviour which creates the society of mass poverty and exploitation in which I live. It is created by the way in which what I do interacts with what other people do. So unless I combine with other people in a conscious attempt to control our collective acts, we still won't be able to recognise our reaction as our own. For example, in a capitalist society the Market, although it is nothing but the sum of the acts of the buyers and sellers, is looked upon as an autonomous entity for whose activities nobody is responsible. The way in which the sway of the market distorts consumption patterns in such a way that individual needs receive priority over much more important collective needs (i.e. things which individuals need, but which they can only afford and consume collectively, like clean air, parks, schools) can only be over-

come by collective action, that is, by socialist planning and ownership.

CHANGEABLE STRUCTURES

So people create their own society without recognising it as their own creation. But it **IS** their own creation, and they **COULD** create it differently.

It is only if the injunction "Love your neighbour" is understood in the context of the assumption that the political structure is a stable constant, rather like the geography of the area, that it becomes possible to imagine that it has no political implications. If my socio-economic relationship to my neighbour is assumed to be immutable, then loving him boils down to strictly personal things like helping him across the street, and not shouting when I tell him which bit of the garden to go and dig. If, on the other hand, these structures are seen as changeable, then decision to love my neighbour immediately requires an analysis of my socio-economic relationship to him — political analysis.

It is not adequate just to **DESCRIBE** the relationship between you and your neighbour. In order to genuinely evaluate it you must be able to compare the given relationship with other possible ones. In order to find out what is possible you have to study the historical origins of the present situation, which means not only, say the particular class structure, but also the particular ways in which the individuals react — since this latter is no more an immutable given than is the class structure.

The point, once again, is not just that an ethico-religious theory **SHOULD** also involve an attempt to formulate a political ideology. It is that it is **IMPOSSIBLE** for it not to do so. The alternatives are not ideology or no ideology. They are thought-out ideology or unconscious acceptance of the ideology which finds its expression in the status quo. A Christian church **CANNOT** in fact divorce itself from politics, from political action, and from the responsibility of thinking about politics. "Not to be involved in politics" means in fact to support the politics of the status quo, to accept as immutable the limitations placed on human relationships by the social structure, and so to reinforce the social structure by acting in terms of it.

NOT NATURAL

I have already mentioned what seems to me to be the central fact about any socio-political structure: it is not natural. It is created by the way in which men behave. This means that men are not only morally but also factually responsible for what happens in their society. A slump is not an earth-quake. A high crime-rate, a high infant-mortality rate in a relatively developed country like South Africa, these are not natural scourges, they are caused by men's actions. Crime proliferates in certain socio-economic conditions. A high infant mortality rate is a product of poverty, which is itself usually the product of a certain way of distributing control of the means of production. In a country like India poverty is not simply caused by overpopulation. It is the result of the fact that the economic surplus which is produced is consumed by a relatively small, wealthy section of the population, instead of being productively re-invested, and of the fact that little or no attempt is made to release the productive energy of the peasants in the creation of a new type of rural society. These are failures on the part of people — essentially on the part of the "ruling class" — and they are failures which are typical of nearly all underdeveloped countries, as well as of developed countries which have large poor sectors. In countries like India, Brazil, Bolivia, Greece, South Africa, or even the UK and the USA, the resources and the potential resources just are not used to solve the problems of poverty, and hence of suffering and death, which exist in those countries.

DETERMINED RESISTANCE

The failure to use the available resources in this way is very rarely just a question of laziness or lack of imagination. It is nearly always the result of determined resistance by privileged groups. As Richard Shaull puts it "When the old order is no longer able to serve men adequately and is too sclerotic to change fast enough to keep up with events, it will have to be brought down or broken by conflict or violence of one sort or another, and the dynamics of God's action in the world moves in that direction. In that situation the violence of the struggle will be determined primarily by those in power, for it is up to them to decide whether the old can make way for the new without

total confrontation and disruption. This does not justify any use of violence at any time by the agents of social change, but it does put the primary responsibility for dealing with violence where it belongs". (New Blackfriars, July, 1968 p. 512). There are two levels of violence here. "The old order", with its unnecessary suffering and death is immediately violent — the structure of the society is violent. Secondly, just demands for change are met with direct violence, whether it be the threat of imprisonment, or actual murder. The structural violence is more serious, and more longlasting, than the repressive violence used to keep the structure in being, but both are the responsibility of the old order. One has to consider the problem of it and when violence should be used to bring about social change in the light of this fact.

So far in this paper I have tried to show that the Christian ethic necessarily has a political dimension, because my relationship to my neighbour is a political relationship, defined by the political structure, and able to be fundamentally changed only to the extent that the political structure is fundamentally changed. However, the political structure can be changed, and therefore it is the Christian's duty to try to change it and to build a society in which people don't get hurt, and to build it in a way that permits genuine personal relationships.

SOCIALISM AND CAPITALISM

I earlier used the word "socialism" to refer to such a society, and I have made a number of implicit criticisms of capitalism in this paper. I would like to conclude by talking specifically about these two forms of society. From a Christian point of view there are, I think, three fundamental criticisms to be made of capitalism. Firstly, the idea that the fundamental mechanism of society should be the profit-motive is in contradiction to the Christian concept of man. Secondly, in a capitalist society the conditions for free spontaneous interhuman relationships — that is, for love — can never be met, for in what is the most important situation in his life — his work situation — the individual finds himself caught up in an authoritarian structure, where, however much trade unions and "social engineering" may have mitigated the brutality of the early period of capi-

talism, nevertheless the basic decisions which effect his life are outside his control, and are made with only incidental consideration for his interests. The authoritarian structure of the work situation vitiates the appearance of political freedom, not only because it allows de facto political privileges to the rich, but more importantly because it provides a model for personal relations which applies at all levels of society, including the relation between elected government and voters. Thirdly, capitalist societies do not seem to be able to solve the problem of providing all their inhabitants with those basic necessities, food, shelter, health, education, without which any talk of freedom is meaningless.

By a socialist society, I mean one in which individuals, acting in terms of the common good, which means the good of all the individuals in the society, try to utilise the means of production to try to satisfy the real needs of the people. What "the real needs of the people" are must be decided by the people, and this can only be done if they are integrated into the decision-making apparatus in some more significant way than a five-yearly vote — particularly through worker's councils involved both in the day to day running of the productive process, and in the elaboration of long-term plans. It is important that the hierarchy which exists even within the factory should be broken down in order for genuine human contact, unmediated by convention and "seniority", to be able to occur. For the distinction between the private and the public sphere which I suggested earlier and which was the basis for the rejection of Church "interference" in politics, cannot in fact be made in practice. It is probably impossible to love your neighbour in anything other than a formalised way in a stratified society.

Bibliography:

- Richard Shaull — A theological perspective on human liberation — New Blackfriars, July 1968.
- Condilium — Faith and the World of Politics, June, 1968.
- Herbert Marcuse — One-Dimensional Man — Routledge.
- Roger Garaudy — From Anathema to Dialogue.
- Anderson & Blackburn — Toward's Socialism — Collins and Fontans.

THE AGONY AND THE ECSTASY

— BISHOP COLIN WINTER

I have been five weeks in Ovamboland, travelling through a country beautiful in Autumn colours, through forests of trees, and revelling in glorious, flaming sunsets. I have slept under the stars at night on the sand-swept floors of countless kraals, and have eaten chicken by the ton, served with Oshifima, a sort of millet porridge. Everywhere I went I have been greeted with overwhelming kindness and unrestrained joy. Now, dust covered and weary with much travelling on indescribably bad roads, I find I have half an hour to tell their story and to get down on paper some of my impressions. The most obvious effect of the trip to the "inter household" is that I have shed nineteen pounds in weight in my travels.

THREE THRUSTS

Church, school and clinic — these are the three thrusts of our Church in Ovamboland. Let's have a look at those churches. First, they are home made. A catechist, whose pay can be as low as a pound a month, fells trees in a forest, drags them some distance with a few willing friends, erects triangles which will support a roof structure, and hauls these on to logs which he has already placed in upright position on the ground. Grass and corn stalks make the roof. This tracery of rough timber and smaller sticks criss crossing is very attractive. It's like looking at a medieval English barn. Next the women get to work. Helped by the children, they make the mud bricks and screed the floor. The roof hangs low, very low, as it is vital to protect these mud walls from the effects of lashing rain. Rain damage would wash everything away.

So the Bishop arrives for a confirmation. For four hours the priests have accompanied him by Land Rover over tracks made dangerous by lopped off stumps of trees. They jump from the truck and move to tiny little rondavels. The people come in great numbers to make their confessions. Dozens of hands are outstretched to welcome their new Bishop. After the preliminary greetings we wait for one or two hours before the service can begin. The people have to travel great distances to get to their church. Often this entails a walk of ten or fifteen miles through the hot deep sand. We see them trudging along, the women carrying their best Sunday clothes in a bundle on their heads. The Land Rover is packed with ten or eleven people clinging on to each other on the back. All we can do as we chug past is to wave and apologise that there is no room. They wave back cheerily and understand. The Catechist stands at the door of the hut

where I am sitting on the cold earth floor. "It is time to start, my Bishop". I join the party outside. None of the three catechists has any shoes. Their Church regalia is clean but ragged. A cassock is green with age; an alb is torn and painfully held together by large stitches. It won't last another washing. The wooden processional cross is a piece of wood with a strip from an orange box as a cross piece. This goes ahead of us. So we enter the Church. We pick our way through people sitting outside in the sunlight. The Church has just been built, but already it is too small. Two thirds of the people cannot get inside. The more lucky ones can gaze in through the openings that serve as windows or through doorways that have no doors.

DARK AND WARM

Inside the Church is dark and warming up like an oven. The people are packed so tightly that the procession moves in single file, and then the gap closes quickly behind us as other people eagerly take up the empty places. Children pour over into the sanctuary and happily sit at the feet of the Bishop. My eyes settle on the altar. The candles are just little stubs and will be lit only during the Prayer of Consecration. The altar linen is full of holes and threadbare. The vases on the altar are empty beer cans. The seat for the Bishop is home-made and leans over at a crazy angle. My predecessor had one collapse with him in it. I say that I will confirm standing — coward that I am!

Joel the catechist moves forward, stands at my side in readiness to interpret for me. His cassock is green with age. It has no sleeves at all in it. I look at his feet and see that he is shoeless. On the wage we pay him he cannot afford such luxuries as shoes. I make a mental note to buy him a pair when I return to Wind-

hoek. (There are ninety five others, too). The Processional cross has been laid reverently in the corner next to the altar. The servers are all sitting on the floor. There are not enough chairs for them all.

Music is swelling through the building from two hundred African voices united in harmony. In the past our church has been weak in teaching music. Now we are greatly helped by the Finnish Lutheran Christians among whom our people live and from whom they pick up tunes and harmonies. They now move to their own composition as a welcome to the Bishop. Roughly translated, it makes me smile with pleasure: "The mothers, the fathers, the grannies, the young, the old, we're all OK at Okasheshete". Not Shakespeare, but bursting at the seams with life and Christian happiness.

They come forward to be confirmed. "Erastus, I sign thee with the sign of the cross and I lay my hands upon thee. Defend, O Lord, this Thy child . . ." It takes me well over two hours to confirm the ones who are presented. Babies cry, mothers breast feed them. Dogs intermittently try to get in and are unceremoniously dumped outside again with lusty howls from both sides. Christ comes. A Church, a whole Church is perfectly still to welcome Him. Black hands reach out to receive Him as Saviour. Women's hands rough and calloused from hoeing; men's hands, big and strong, are next, and then come the aged, the blind, the sickly. Everywhere I go there are dozens of blind people led to the altar holding on to the stick of a guide who goes before. Often, I am told, they lost their sight as children. Flies settled on their eyes. Mothers panicked, not knowing what to do as the inflammation steadily got worse. Red eyes became inflamed masses of poison. There is no clinic and so a witchdoctor is sought out.

Potions are placed into the infected eyes as incantations are offered. The whole pupil is burnt white in the process. Someone in America asked how we had the audacity to make them Christians when we in the West have made such a bad job of it ourselves. I wish that questioner could be with me when I look at so many people here with sightless eyes.

FIVE CATECHISTS

We have five catechists in this particular area. Each one of them has built a Church with his own hands and started a bush school. "Please send us a nurse", they ask me. I had stopped the Land Rover to find a place on it for a pregnant woman carrying a child of five in her arms. The child's head bounced up and down as the woman strode along. Her little arms dangled limply down. We raced her to the Mission clinic. Two days later she is still on a saline drip. In her case blocked bowels were treated with a witchdoctor's brew. Dehydration set in. Death stalked and was cheated. In hundreds of other cases it isn't. I understand now why they plead so urgently with me, "Send us a nurse".

She settles herself in the hut and addresses me. "My name is Naomi. I have been teaching the children in the bush school at Ongula Netanga for the past four and a half years. I receive no pay. I do my work for God. I am humbly asking the Bishop for thirty slates. The children write only in the sand with their fingers. I need

also one catechism and one New Testament in Quanjama". Little enough to ask for, but repeated in every place I call, so that I begin to sag with sheer dismay. There is just not enough to grant it. "We must give it to them", my Archdeacon insists in protests as he looks into my face. I agree we must and with God's help we shall. "Order the slates" — on faith.

A border fence separates the Ovambo people who live in our Diocese from their brothers, sisters and cousins who live on the other side in Angola. I am told we may not even construct a "lean to" shelter on the other side. Their catechist, an old man, does not understand this. He begins his speech to me. "I do my work for no pay. Some of my people come twenty miles to Church. Some very old, Bishop. It is great hardship for them. No one else ministers to them, only our Church. They are many sheep. Often Fr. Lazarus walk many miles with me, baptising the people and saying Mass under the trees. We ask the Bishop to get permit for us from government to build a Church building. We get very wet in the rainy season. We all greet our Bishop and ask him to do this. We will build the Church ourselves". When I ask about numbers I am told by the priest that there are seven hundred members. 'I saw all Israel scattered like sheep without a shepherd'. Trouble, even, imprisonment could follow if they attempt to erect a shelter without permission. Where does one begin to sort this out?

LEFT MY TRIBE

"My name is Titus. I have left my tribe and my own people to minister to the heathen people in the West, where there is no one else to look after them. I have been away from my wife and children for many months. I ask the Bishop for clothes for this heathen woman. She is naked and too ashamed to come to classes". I make a rapid calculation that the twenty pounds I was setting aside to purchase him a bicycle must now be given to buy clothes for his naked flock. Will he agree to this? A broad African smile tells me where his priorities are. It was just the same in the East. "Brethren, do not take all the clothes", the old priest tells his brother clergy, "there are many Bushmen who are naked who need them more than us". They replace the articles of second-hand clothing I had asked them to share among themselves as they readily agree to his request. Africans know how to share.

This is Damaraland's story: "The Land Rover has broken down, please send us another. The girls' hostel is a disgrace. It must be rebuilt or fall-down when the rains come... Send us a nurse, the people are sickly... give us a teacher... please help us with slates... I am humbly asking the Bishop for a bicycle... my brother in jail for pass offence, please send me £25... we all OK at Okasheshete, Bishop". The agony and the ecstasy. Lord Christ strengthen us that we will not fail them.

WHAT YOU SHOULD DO IN RESPONSE TO THE CRISIS OF OUR TIMES

— ARCHBISHOP HELDER CAMARA

YOUNG BRITONS SHOULD LEAD THE PROTEST OF YOUTH IN THE WORLD

How are we to meet the crisis before the United Kingdom and the whole world? I expect you have asked yourselves this question. If you will allow me to, I shall give you a reply which will shock your elders, but which I hope will be understood by those whose hearts are young — it is this. You should complete the message of the Beatles.

The Beatles attracted the attention of the whole world, and were in the vanguard of Youth's protest in every

continent. Called by different names but with certain characteristics in common, sometimes at variance with

one another, young colleagues of the Beatles protested against the monstrous way we live today, with our false values, against the ridiculous mechanisation of everything, including man himself.

Let me give you one example. Look at the picture we are given of life in North America. Can we fail to understand the hippies, their slogans, their lyricism, their psychedelic excesses and their terrible bitterness.

I am sixty years old, but I hope I am capable of understanding what young people think. Let me list for a start the seven deadly sins of the contemporary world, sins which young people have identified and repudiated. Intuitively, without prior discussion, one might say be divine inspiration, they have joined the ranks against racism, colonialism, war, paternalism, pharisaism, estrangement and fear.

If I am right in my interpretation of these evils, perhaps I can help to give you a practical direction to your protest.

Youth, on all sides faces the 7 deadly sins of the modern world.

Why cannot youth tolerate racism?

Racism is not a simple matter of white against black; it is also black systematically shutting itself off from white. Racism is not only the persecution of Jews; it is also contempt for West Indians, Indians and Pakistanis. Racism is an attitude which despises and oppresses another human creature or groups of human creatures because they are of a different race and a different colour.

The white man once convinced himself that he was superior to the coloured man, that he had a special mission to dominate the world. If there is any merit in this delusion it is up to him to help the poorest races to achieve a human level of life — negroes in Africa, in the USA, in Brazil, in Haiti; Asians in Asia; mulattoes in Latin America; the Indians in North America.

Young people know that a great part of the coloured world lives in subhuman conditions because of injustices of which it is the victim. Give any of them good food, good clothes, good housing, even the minimum conditions of education, health and work, they can go, with love, as far as, even further than the white man, in intelligence, in culture and in virtue.

Young people do not believe that any separation, any discrimination, any injustice should follow because a man's skin is of a different colour, or because his jaw and his nose are of a different shape, or because he has a different hair style or a peculiar smell.

Why does youth not tolerate colonialism?

Young people are not interested in the origins of colonialism; it isn't

possible to judge yesterday's events with today's vision. They may admit that colonialism was at one time more or less inevitable, that its intentions were probably generous and that it has left here and there some good fruits. But the balance is terribly negative.

Young people know that in our time there is no longer any place for colonialism. They also reject domestic colonialism — and by this term I mean the existence of privileged minorities whose wealth is supported by the misery of millions of their fellow citizens. They applaud the political realism and courage with which the United Kingdom has dismantled her Empire on which the sun never set (and it hurt in a very special way to let go of India!) Young people too, are very quick to spot the neo-colonialism denounced by Pope John XXIII; they know that political without economic independence is virtually worthless; they know that to attribute the very low economic level of the Third World to the incapacity, prejudice and dishonesty of coloured peoples is to connive at the grave injustices committed by the developed peoples against the underdeveloped. Compare, for example, the very low prices which are paid for the primary products of the poor countries to the invariably high prices paid for the industrialised products of the rich.

Young people do not want to see a world divided between countries which achieve industrialisation and those which sink even further into underdevelopment and want. They reject comfort and luxury, for they know that it is provided by the blood, sweat and tears to two-thirds of humanity.

Why young people do not tolerate war?

Young people reject war, world war as well as local war, hot war as well as cold.

War grows every day more inhuman and immoral. It has no place now for that apparent heroism, when warriors matched their courage and their skill against each other. Today, guided missiles bring death to civil populations including, without discrimination, the old, the sick, the young; and destruction to schools, hospitals and churches.

World war, we all know, now puts at hazard the very survival of the

human race on this planet, just at a time when man feels himself able through technology to provide a properly human standard of living to men of all continents.

Local wars are no less costly in human life and money, no less inhuman and cruel. The cold war, like hot war, keeps alive the arms race and uses money which could be used to bring all countries out of underdevelopment and want.

It is not because they are afraid, that young people are opposed to war. It is from contempt and revulsion; war is a cowardly business, unworthy of the century that has discovered electronics and space travel.

Why youth will not put up with paternalism?

If young people reject paternalism, this has nothing to do with rejecting their parents or parental love.

Paternalism in society is the attitude which creates all facilities for a servile state — security against accidents at work, education, social assistance, good salaries, everything that you can consider necessary, provided that the beneficiaries are not expected to use either brain or will.

Paternalism is afraid of the awakening of conscience, when eyes are opened to social realities. Paternalism dislikes the attitude of men who ungratefully reject benefits and demand rights.

Today, young people know that at the root of the disagreement between social classes in one country lies the attitude of the rich, who feel that the problem can be solved by aid, generosity and the proper distribution of the crumbs that fall from their tables.

A paternalist thinks that a rich man who received Lazarus is good; the rich man who turns him away is bad. A paternalist believes that a socially enlightened employer should respect social legislation, pay a legal wage, offer social services, provide a canteen and a social club.

To do more than this, to alter the structure of industry or business, is, however, subversion and communism.

Young people reject paternalism, also, in relations between developed and underdeveloped peoples. The problem in this case, is essentially one of justice, not merely of aid.

Why youth will not put up with Pharisaism?

Young people are against all manifestations of pharisaism, are against puritans who in their families demand a morality which they are the first to break, against religious-minded people, especially the clergy, who make a terrible fuss about sex but who lack that charity without which purity becomes aggressive and pharisaical.

Young people rebel especially against international pharisaism, when demonstrated either by capitalist or by socialist countries.

Capitalism, despite its championship of the human individual and freedom, is egotistic, selfish and cruel. It does not hesitate to crush human beings when profit demands it. Under the banner of saving the Free World, it commits terrible atrocities against freedom. It speaks proudly of tradition and family, but it does not create the right conditions for workers and small proprietors to rear their families. It makes much of religion when it supports its own interests but it defies and persecutes it when it fights for the development of the whole man and of all men. In the name of individual initiative, it supports national and international trusts and combines.

For its part, Marxism calls itself the only authentic humanism. In practice, superpowers, professing inspiration from Marx, are as cold and egotistical as their capitalist rivals. They do not admit pluralism in the socialist world; they fear intelligence, liberty, creativity and originality when these do not conform to the rigid precepts of the Party; they nurture super-militarism, and promote wars which are in no way different from capitalist wars. They shut themselves up in atheism without realising that one can believe in a Creator and not feel oneself a slave but a Co-creator, charged with subduing nature and consummating Creation.

Many do not understand why young people have set themselves on fire, in Vietnam and in Czechoslovakia.

Young people are prepared now for the logical alliance between America and Russia, and for an imperialist war between Russia and China.

Young people demand respect for words, honesty and values. They want no pretence and an end of pharisaism.

Why youth will not tolerate an estranged society?

Young people nearly always see further and deeper than adults and regret that there should be so many fathers and teachers, writers and politicians who persist in flying in the face of history, in the teeth of time and space.

They oppose above all being submitted to Universities which are divorced from the age in which they live — they may have been very good for the 16th, 17th, 18th, 19th and 20th centuries, but not for the 21st which has already begun.

Young people, above all, will reject any suggestion to adjust university life to automation within obsolete capitalist patterns.

Why youth will not tolerate fear?

I have already referred to six of the seven deadly sins of the world today: racism, colonialism, war, paternalism, pharisaism and estrangement. That leaves fear.

Young people see the fear of the poor and the fear of the rich. Material and physical underdevelopment leads to moral underdevelopment. When want, hunger, total dependence on the rich and powerful exist, then there is fear. Fear of unemployment, of losing their wretched hovels, fear of arrest, of being beaten and killed. People are afraid to speak; to answer up; to upset anyone. Two-thirds of humanity live in this fear.

When one thinks of the happy and prosperous third, one ought to think that it has no fear. But it has. It is afraid of Communism, of revolution, of structural change. It fears what we Brazilians call conscientizacao, the awakening of conscience. It is afraid of the population explosion, of an uprising of coloured peoples. It lives in a state of nervous tension and shock. Its happiness is disturbed by the shadow of fear.

Young people long for a world without traumas, neuroses, psychoses, shocks and fears.

The great step before you

It is good to take up your stand against the seven deadly sins of today. But you can and must go further. You must create a multi-racial world, in which different races respect one

another, associate and mingle as brothers. You must change fundamentally the pattern of international trade, eliminate neo-colonialism and promote the development of all mankind. You must make war on war, so that we may realise that great appeal of Pope Paul VI. "No more war, Never again war". You must overcome paternalism, what you might call "assistentialism", which denies rights, especially the greatest right of all, that of "conscientizacao", the awakening of conscience. You must eradicate pharisaism among individuals, families, national and international; you must prevent estrangement, especially in the universities. You must be afraid of only one thing, the fear of being afraid.

Is this utopian? No, my dear friends. You know it isn't. In your literature I saw a mention of the Haslemere group. As a man of the Third World I don't hesitate to say to you: either I am very much mistaken or here you see all these ideas fully supported. You need hardly ask for a clearer vision or more certain guidance than you will receive from this group.

We should say, like Churchill, if it is not the beginning of the end, it is certainly the end of the beginning.

Young people of the United Kingdom, I meet you engaged on thoughts that are profound and serious. I find you studying a lucid and courageous programme of thought and action. I see you so committed to the great and human problems of Britain and the World, that I feel **you** have the authority to raise that cry which all young people want to hear in every country: "youth of the world, unite".

Even if your elders persist in retaining structures and systems of society that stratify international injustice and generate war, at least let young people of all the world join hands and rise above all discriminations, whether of race, economics, politics, society and religion.

Even though you may not know it, the greatest friend of all young people will be with you. You have been shocked at the way our weakness has distorted his message. But this friend is capable of understanding your excesses, encouraging your generosity and crowning your hopes with success. You will have a friend who will never deceive you, Jesus Christ.

Die Kerk Buite Suid-Afrika

— PROF. B. B. KEET

IERLAND

Die Ierse kwessie staan weer op die voorgrond, nie alleen weëns sport-aangeleenthede nie, maar veral op Kerklike gebied. Om die agtergrond hiervan te verstaan, moet ons teruggaan tot die tyd toe Ulster met sy Protestantse deel van die bevolking, aansluiting by Engeland gesoek en verkry het.

So kwaai was die middelpunt van die stryd (Londonderry) dat die Roomse deel, wat hulle vir die eenheid van die hele Ierland beywer het, weier om die London by Derry te voeg en nog altyd praat van Derry, terwyl die Protestante Londonderry verkies. Die getalle in Ulster van Protestante en Rooms-Katolieke is nagenoeg gelyk, maar die vyandskap tussen die twee groepe is waarskynlik die felste bekend.

Nou het daar, onder leiding van Rev. Ian Paisley, 'n opvlamming van die stryd gekom, wat die wêreldpers in beroering bring. Van belang is derhalwe 'n onderhoud wat oor die Ierse-kwessie met Rev. R. D. Gallagher, Voorsitter van die Ierse Raad van Protestantse Kerke, oor die rol van die Kerk gevoer is. (Ek neem dit in die vorm van vraag en antwoord, gedeeltelik oor).

Vraag: Wat is die vernaamste kerke in die Protestantisme van Noord-Ierland, en wat is hul verhouding tot Eerwaarde Ian Paisley?

Antwoord: Die drie vernaamste kerke in Noord-Ierland is die Presbiteriaanse Kerk van ongeveer 380,000 lede (wat nou en nooit konneksie, direk of indirek, met Paisley se "Vrye Presbiteriaanse Kerk" gehad het nie). Die Kerk van Ierland (Anglikaans 300,000) en die Metodiste Kerk. Daar is verskeie ander denominasies, die gesamentlike getal waarvan ongeveer gelyk staan met die Metodiste (85,000).

Vraag: Wie is Eerwaarde Paisley, en hoe groot is die getalsterkte van sy Kerk?

Antwoord: Die Vrye Presbiteriaanse Kerk, afgesien van enige politieke volgelingen wat Paisley het, is baie klein. Behalwe die gemeente waar hy elke Sondag optree, is die getal mense wat sy dienste elders bywoon, betrek-

lik klein. Mnr. Paisley was self nooit 'n Presbiteriaan nie. Sy bediening in Belfast het begin met sy aanstelling as leraar van 'n Evangeliese Sendingkerk in Ravenhillweg. Uit 'n aantal gevalle van onrus in Presbiteriaanse gemeentes kon hy voordeel trek deur Vrye Presbiteriaanse Kerke uit die ontevredenes te vorm. Sedertdien het hy die politiek-godsdienstige situasie gebruik deur 'lent-missions' in die areas te hou, en 'n aantal ander gemeentes te stig.

Vraag: Deur 'n groot deel van die pers word die indruk verwek dat alle Protestante volgelingen van Mnr. Paisley is — is dit waar?

Antwoord: Daar is ongetwyfeld 'n verhouding van verhouding, veral in die laaste weke, gewees; tog sal dit 'n fout wees om te meen dat alle Protestante volgelingen van Paisley is. Hy praat sekerlik vir die ekstremiste en ander. Daar is egter, 'n baie groot middestand van gematigde Protestante, wat graag goeie gemeenskapsverhouding met die Rooms-Katolieke wil hê. Hierdie mense stel nie groot belang in Kerkvereniging of Kerklike samesmelting nie. Hulle sou elke kompromis van geloof en beginsels teenstaan. Dié gevoeligheid teen Roomse neiginge is deur die Paisley-groep geëksploiteer.

Vraag: Verwarring, suspisie en vrees vier blykbaar hoogty in Noord-Ierland vandag — waarom?

Antwoord: Voorgangers op politieke gebied het nog nie geleer wat billikheid en geregtigheid beteken in terme van huise, werk en poste nie. Die gevolg was verwarring en 'n begryplike stilswye, omdat daar so 'n gebrek is aan sterk, aktiewe, vooruitstrewende politieke leierskap. Die fenomenale antwoord op die vorige Eerste Minister se boodskap oor die radio in Desember het die groot om-

vang van die middelgroep geopenbaar. Dit is nog 'n werklikheid daar, maar dinamiese politieke leierskap is dringend en voortdurend nodig, om dit tot openbaring te bring.

Vraag: In hoever het die Kerk in Noord-Ierland politieke verbetering en billike behandeling vir almal gesoek?

Antwoord: Die Protestantse Kerke en die Ierse Raad van Kerke het almal, nie net eenmaal nie, maar meermale 'n versoek vir hervorming, en 'n einde aan alle onreg, aan die regering gerig. Hierdie oproepe is gedoen lank voor die begin van die huidige agitatie. Hulle het telkens te kenne gegee wat hulle wil hê — 'n einde aan alle diskriminasie, die toekenning van poste in die politieke diens, noukeurige en billike behuising volgens behoefte, gelyke regte vir alle burgers, volle deelname van elke burger aan plaaslike stemreg, billike en regverdige stemming op Parlementêre vlak en op Regerings-grensbepalinge, onafhanklike ondersoek op hoogste vlak van die oorsake van gemeenskaps-onrus.

Vraag: Wat is die verhouding van die Protestantse Kerke in Noord-Ierland en dié van die Republiek in Ierland?

Antwoord: Ierland is wel politiek verdeeld, maar daar is geen skeidsmuur tussen die kerke nie. Die Kerk van Ierland (Anglikaans) is 'n kerk vir die hele Ierse Republiek. Die Presbiteriaanse (Gereformeerde) Kerk het 'n Moderator en Algemene Vergadering vir die hele Ierland. Die Metodiste-Kerk het 'n Voorsitter en Konferensie vir die hele Ierland. Die jaarlikse vergaderings van hierdie Kerke is vanjaar in Dublin gehou. Volgende jaar sal die Konferensie van die Metodiste-Kerke, en die Algemene Vergadering van die Presbiteriaanse Kerk in Belfast vergader. Die Protestantse Sinode van die Kerk van Ierland sal in Dublin gehou word.

Ons herinner net, dat hierdie vrae en antwoorde op gesag van Rev. Eric Gallagher, Voorsitter van die Ierse Raad van Kerke gegee word.

GELUKWENSE AAN DR. B. ENGELBRECHT

On behalf of the editorial board and the readers of our journal, we congratulate Dr. B. Engelbrecht on his appointment as senior lecturer in the Divinity Department at the University of the Witwatersrand. This appointment is a well-earned acknowledgement of the academic ability of one who for a long time has deserved such a post. We regard it even as an honour done to our journal that its editor has been accorded this distinction.

Since 1st August, 1965 when Dr. Engelbrecht joined the editorial staff, he set a theological standard of a high scientific level with ability and exceptional thoroughness. This has enabled the journal to enjoy a wide circulation far beyond the borders of South Africa. He approached the problems of our country from the basis of his Reformed convictions with an honesty and objectivity that made his editorials particularly relevant. He was especially concerned with the negligence or deviation of the Afrikaans Churches in failing to give a clear Scriptural witness concerning the policy of apartheid. These churches sometimes interpreted this as a failure in love but in truth it was the opposite: it was the proof of his love and deep concern for these churches and especially the one to which he belongs viz. the Dutch Reformed Church. One day when the history of this crisis period is written, the prophetic insight and strength of his words will receive the acknowledgement they are now denied.

Fortunately Dr. Engelbrecht's departure to the University of the Witwatersrand is no farewell to Pro Veritate. We look forward to receiving regular articles from him. We wish him God's richest blessings in his new career and thank him for his valuable contributions and dedicated service towards the journal.

CONGRATULATIONS TO DR. B. ENGELBRECHT

Namens die redaksionele raad en lesers van ons blad wil ons dr. B. Engelbrecht van harte gelukwens met sy benoeming as senior lektor in die Departement van Godgeleerdheid aan die Universiteit van die Witwatersrand. Hierdie aanstelling is 'n welverdiende erkenning van die akademiese bekwaamheid en toerusting van iemand wat lank vantevore reeds so 'n pos verdien het en ons beskou dit as 'n besondere eer vir ons blad dat sy redakteur hierdie onderskeiding te beurt geval het.

Vanaf 1 Augustus 1965, toe dr. Engelbrecht tot die redaksie van die blad toegetree het, het hy met groot bekwaamheid en uiterste deeglikheid 'n teologiese standaard van wetenskaplikheid gestel wat die blad 'n wye leserskring ver buite die grense van Suid-Afrika gegee het. Vanuit sy gereformeerde oortuiging het hy die probleme van ons land benader met 'n eerlikheid en objektiwiteit wat aan sy inleidingsartikels 'n besondere aktualiteit verleen het. Hy was veral besorgd oor die versuim of afwyking van die Afrikaanse Kerke om insake die apartheidspolitiek 'n duidelike Skrifgetuienis te lewer en van Afrikaans-Kerklike kant is dit soms as gebrek aan liefde tot dié groep van Kerke gesien. In werklikheid was dit die teenoorgestelde: die bewys van sy innige liefde tot en diepe besorgdheid oor hierdie Kerke en by name die Nederduits Gereformeerde Kerk waartoe hy behoort het. Wanneer eendag die geskiedenis van hierdie bewoë tydperk geskryf word, sal die profetiese insig en krag van sy woord die erkenning ontvang wat hom nou misgun word.

Gelukkig is dr. Engelbrecht se vertrek na die Universiteit van Witwatersrand geen afskeid van Pro Veritate nie. Ons sien uit daarna om gereeld artikels uit sy pen te ontvang. Ons wens hom Gods rykste seën toe in sy nuwe loopbaan en dank hom vir sy waardevolle bydrae en toegewyde diens tot die blad.

Special – Course for Translators

A training course especially designed for translators is planned for

**16th February to 2nd March
1970**

In previous courses we tried to provide a small amount of help for translators but it soon became clear that the only way to do something at all adequate was to have a course devoted solely to the work of translation.

The course will be conducted by **Mr. Bengt Simonsson**, Director of the Africa Literature Centre. Out of his wide experience in Africa Mr. Simonsson has prepared a course which should prove of considerable benefit to all who undertake the task of translating into (or out of) African languages.

An opportunity such as this comes only rarely and we urge all who are in any way involved

in translation to take advantage. All who are serving the Church in South Africa and the surrounding countries will be welcome, subject to the usual provision that enrolment will be limited to the first 15 people who apply.

We have to make this restriction because much of the course — like the courses previously held — will consist of personal tuition and this obviously sets a limit on the number of students.

The course will be held at **St. Peter's Lodge, Rosettenville, Johannesburg**

where, as we know from past experience, all the facilities for a residential course are first-class.

The fee for the course will be R20, half of which is payable on registration. Travelling

expenses are to be borne by the students or their sponsors. We are able to keep the fee so low because of subsidies from S.P.C.K. and the Literature Centre. Because this is a subsidised course we ask that all application forms should be endorsed by some Church authority.

A number of applications have already been received, so please act at once! Please pass on information about the course to any who may be interested.

Full details will be sent to enrolled students in good time before the opening of the course.

Write to:

**The Secretary for Christian
Literature,
77 Fourth Avenue,
Newton Park,
Port Elizabeth.**

