

PRO

VERITATE

INHOUD/CONTENTS

Rejoice . . . and Weep	1
Burger van Twee Wêreld	1
Inleidingsartikel/Editorial	5
Pursuing Dead Dogs and Fleas	7
Theology in the Crucible	11
Die Kerk Buite Suid-Afrika	14
The Church and Industry	15

CHRISTELIKE MAANDBLAD VIR SUIDELIKE AFRIKA—CHRISTIAN MONTHLY FOR SOUTHERN AFRICA

June 15 Junie 1966

Jaargang V, Nr. 2

By die Hoofposkantoor as Nuusblad geregistreer.

5c

(S.A.) Intekengeld R1 Subscription

Volume V, No. 2

Registered at the Post Office as a Newspaper.

REJOICE... AND WEEP...

(Rejoice with those who rejoice, and weep with those who weep.— Romans 12:15)*

THE REV. ROBERT ORR

For some time now, this pulpit has not had much to say on matters of national importance. That is not because I believe God has nothing to say to this nation. I believe that God has a great deal to say to us. It is because I have been asking myself whether the best way to submit our national life to God's judgement, the best way to challenge people to think and act as Christian citizens is by preaching sermons about it.

But this Sunday, things are rather different. The Christian Churches have been specially invited to refer to the Festival of the Republic. It would be highly discourteous to refuse. It would be something of an offence against charity not to say something on this occasion which means so much to so many South Africans. It is a pity that this should be on the Sunday following Ascension. We need to think about the Ascension and its meaning. But we may find that the Ascension has something to say to us at Festival time too.

IN A SPIRIT OF LOVE

What I plead for at Festival time is this: I plead for you and all South African Christians to approach this Festival in a spirit of love for our fellow-citizens. You know what love means? It means, at least, putting ourselves in the other man's shoes and seeing things from the other man's point of view. I know that there are many of us who believe that a great deal of money is being spent on the Festival, money which could be put to better use. I know that there are many of us who believe that five years is a very short time, a mere wink of time, in fact, compared to our history of three hundred years,
(Continued on page 2)

BURGER VAN TWEE WÊRELDE

'N NABETRAGTING OOR DIE REPUBLIEKFEES

DR. W. BRUCKNER DE VILLIERS

Soos baie van my mede-Afrikaners het ek ook vasgenael voor die radio gesit en aandagtig die verrigtinge teen die hange van die Monumentkoppie gevolg. Saam met die daar versamelde volksmassa het ek ook begeesterd geraak, meer as eenmaal 'n knop in die keel gekry en selfs af en toe 'n stille traan gestort — 'n traan van deernis oor hulle wat in ons volksverlede soveel gely het om vir ons, hulle nasate, te verdien wat ons vandag besit, al kon hulle dit self nooit belewe nie; en 'n traan van trots oor alles wat, ten spyte van alle teenslae, tot nou toe reeds presteer is deur hierdie klein volkie waartoe ek ook genadiglik en met dankbaarheid behoort.

TROTS

Onwillekeurig — watter „ras-egte“ Afrikaner (en dit was tog, per slot van sake, wesenlik 'n Afrikanerfees) sou dit kon verhelp? — het my gedagtes weemoedig-trots teruggeflits oor die lang, bewoë pad waarlangs my volk voortgeworstel het tot by hierdie mylpaal in sy geskiedenis: na die volksplanting meer as drie eeue gelede en die onwankelbare geloof en optimisme van die destydse stigters van 'n blanke, Christelike beskawing hier te lande; na die Hugenote-voorvaders op wie ek my beroem, wat alles prysgegee het terwille van

hulle geloof en soveel geestesadel ingedem het in die lewe van hierdie jong en wordende volk; na die stoere Godsmanne wat die fundamente van die Kerk van Christus so heg en stewig gelê het te midde van 'n omringende barbaardom; na die Voortrekkers en hul beginselvaste weiering om hulle te berus by die imposisies van die Vreemde Veroweraar; na hul worstelstryd in wildernis en woestyn, wat alleen in die geloof volvoer kon word; na die lang reeks Kafferoorloë waarmee my volk se pioniers geteister is op die voorposte van 'n nuwe beskawing; na die anneksasie van alles
(Vervolg op bladsy 3)

Rejoice... and Weep...

(Continued from page 1)

and that extensive celebrations like this would be more appropriate after fifty years of safe and stable growth. I know that there are some of us who believe that these celebrations are only a continuation of Nationalist Party rejoicing over the election results. But I plead with you to pause and think this out in a spirit of love, from the other man's point of view. Let us, with sympathy and understanding, enter into the hearts and minds of those to whom this anniversary is an occasion for rejoicing. Let us realise that, five years ago, many of our fellow-South-Africans felt a sense of liberation from something that had irked and worried them for half a century. Those of us who valued the ties with the Commonwealth should be sensible enough to realise that those ties were more sentimental than real, that the old associations had become so tenuous that they were hardly significant. Some of us may feel that our associations with the Commonwealth in no way restricted our national independence. Maybe so. The point is that many South Africans did see them in that light, and felt this sense of liberation when the ties were severed. A desire for true national independence is surely something which we can understand, something with which we can sympathise. It is a common desire in our continent and in the world, and we generally regard it as right and commendable. It is a sign that a country believes itself to be growing to maturity, to be able to take adult responsibility for its own decisions and actions, responsibility that is not subject to review by anyone else.

So, no matter what reservations we may have about the celebrations being expensive and premature, let us, as Scripture commands "rejoice with those who rejoice". Even if we cannot put on an act, cannot pretend to celebrate the occasion itself, let us rejoice in the rejoicing of our friends, our fellow countrymen, our Christian brethren. Let us be happy because they are happy.

ONE FAMILY

We are to rejoice with those who rejoice, and, the Scripture says, to "weep with those who weep". God has put us in this land, God has made us members of the South African family. The fortunes and misfortunes of the members of that family are our fortunes and misfortunes as well. When they laugh, we will laugh with them. When they weep, we will weep with them. Let us not forget, then, that God, in his wisdom, has made us members of a very big family. Let us not think that we belong only to a family of about three million people. In fact, God has put us into a family that numbers about fourteen million, a family marked by an astonishingly rich diversity. Goodness knows, the white part of the family is rich enough in its diversity — Afrikaans and English, Dutch and German, Scots and Welsh and Irish, Italians and Portuguese, Greeks and Jews. But the non-white part of the family is even richer in its variety, with at least eight main groups among the African people, the fascinating variety among the Coloured people and the exotic culture of the Indian people in Natal. All these go to make up the kaleidoscope that is South Africa. All these have something to contribute to our understanding of life, of man, of God. All these are members of our family. When they rejoice, we will rejoice. When they weep, we will weep.

When a child of ours cries over some hurt, what do we do? We find out what makes him cry. We not only comfort him by assuring him of our love and understanding, we put matters right so that he no longer has cause to cry. So with members of our South African family. Do they weep because of the unrelenting, disheartening struggle with poverty and hunger? We shall see to it that the good fortune and prosperity of our land is reasonably shared. Do they weep because rules and regulations make it hard for them to enjoy a normal and natural family life? We shall work and pray for a society in which all may have this God-given right. Do they weep because others treat them as children who will never grow up, who will never be permitted

to take adult responsibility for their decisions and actions, who can never be allowed the same rights and freedoms as others? We shall weep with them and assure them of our work and prayers for a society in which they are assisted to true maturity.

UNITY

To rejoice with those who rejoice, to weep with those who weep — this is a sacrament of unity. On national occasions such as this, talk of unity is much in the air. But we do not create or achieve unity by talking about it, nor shall we find unity by shouting slogans about it. Behind the talk and the slogans we hide something that destroys real unity. We hide our thoughts that unity is not a matter of each making his contribution to the common good, but a matter of the other man surrendering to my philosophy. We hide our unwillingness to understand the other man's point of view. We hide our refusal to be absolutely honest with one another, and our refusal to compromise for the sake of unity.

Where shall we find unity? One of the most tragic, most distressing, most frightening things I have heard recently was said to me by a very good friend who is also a prominent South African churchman. He said "I do not believe we shall find unity until both Afrikaner and Englishman have to fight side by side in a war against a common enemy". The more I think about those words the more my heart sinks, the more I want to weep bitter tears of shame and rage. Ignore, for the moment, that the thought is only of white unity. What makes me ashamed and most desperately unhappy is that these words, if they are true, represent the most colossal confession of failure on the part of the Christian Church. For what do these words mean? They mean that all our talks of being reconciled to God through Jesus Christ and to our fellowmen through Jesus Christ is so much hot air. They mean that all our talk about the fellowship of God's people with one another is no more than talk. They mean that all our preaching about Christian love going deeper than all natural differences between men is just

so much sound and fury, signifying nothing. They mean that all our quoting of Paul's words: "There is no such thing as Jew and Greek, slave and freeman, male and female; for you are all one person in Christ Jesus" — that this has no more meaning than the rustling of the wind through the trees. They mean that Christians in this country have refused to submit their relationships with other men to the judgement of Christ. They mean that — as far as we are concerned — the Gospel of love is wonderful in theory, but cannot be expected to work in practice. They mean that if we want unity, we must not work for Christ. We must work for war. If all this is true, then why, in the name of honesty and truth, do we not sell our church buildings, use the money to pension off our ministers, and carry on life in the normal way? What difference would it make? If all this is true, then it would make no difference at all.

Why, then, don't we do it? Because there is in the minds of some of us a tiny hope, and in the minds of some of us a passionate conviction that in fact Christ is the only answer to our longing for unity. To see in that other man a person created by God, to see in that other man a person for whom Christ died, to see in that other man a brother who needs Christ just as much as I do, to see in that other man a person who longs for my love and understanding as much as I long for his, to see in that other man one whom I can serve in Christ's name — this is the only way to true unity. It is only from this kind of unity, also, that we shall receive the strength that God promises.

The Ascension? Well, the Ascension is the festival of Christ's coronation as the rightful king of men and nations. Our private life as individuals, our public life as a nation, these are to be governed by Christ the King. We have an alternative, of course. We can enthrone Christ as King in our hearts and in our nation. Or, we shall receive him as our Judge.

* Sermon delivered on Sunday after Ascension, 22nd May, 1966 — the Sunday in Republic Festival Week — St. Andrew's Presbyterian Church, Pretoria and St. Andrew's-in-the-South.

BURGER VAN TWEE

WÊRELDE

(Vervolg van bladsy 1)

wat so duur gekoop is deur 'n magtige en onweerstaanbare wêreldryk; na die volksverkreupelende Anglo-Boere-oorloë; na die tragiese volksverarming, verdeeldheid en bittere broedertwiste wat daarop gevolg het; na die politieke en ekonomiese woestynverblyf van die van-sy-regmatige-erfenis-berooftde Afrikaner; en na die uiteindelijke deurbraak en oorwinning teen die felste en skynbaar mees onoorwinlike teenstand in . . .

Watter ware bloed-Afrikaner kan dan anders as om trots te wees op so 'n volksverlede? Watter Afrikaner se hart swel nie van trots as hy dink aan die heldedade en prestasies van die verlede, aan 'n Bloedrivier en 'n Majuba, en aan die groot heldenleiersfigure met wie se name sy volksgeskiedenis deurspek is nie?

Kan die wêreld daarbuite ons werklik ons nasietrots kwalik neem? Durf enige buitestaander — gesien die relatiewe onlangsheid van gebeure en die veelbevoënheid van 'n bloot driehonderdjarige volksgeskiedenis — ons die ietwat emosionele, selfs sentimentele, oorspitsdheid van ons nasie-bewustheid ontsê?

Ons hoef daar voorwaar nie oor skaam te wees nie. En ek as 'n Afrikaner in murg en bloed is dit hoegenaamd nie. As die Engelsman, die Fransman, die Duitser en die Amerikaner van tyd tot tyd vervuld kan raak van 'n bykans selfbewuste nasietrots, dan ek ook! En veral dan tydens 'n periodieke „volksfees“, soos die afgelope Republiekfees, wanneer 'n mens waaragtig daarop geregtig is om vir 'n wyle as't ware die teuels van die emosie 'n bietjie skiet te gee en in onbeskaamde sentimentele vervoering verswelg te raak oor dit wat jy as jou „volkseie“ beskou.

Hierdie emosionaliteit ten opsigte van alles wat „volks“ is, en daarom ook van 'n mens self as lid van 'n geïdealiseerde, en alte dikwels geïdoliseerde, volk is nie alleen kenmerkend van die Afrikaanse volk nie. Dit is 'n algemene, 'n wêreldwye verskynsel

en gegewe, veral onder relatief jong en nog selfbewuste nasies, en 'n verskynsel waarmee deeglik rekening gehou moet word.

Ook in myself as individu is 'n sodanige geneigdheid tot emosionele nasionalisme 'n onomstootlike gegewe, 'n nie-wegrede-neerbare verskynsel: 'n swakheid in sekere sin, maar tegelykertyd ook 'n krag, wat deel uitmaak van my hele individuele menswees as een van 'n besondere groep, as lid van 'n nasie, as deelgenoot aan 'n besondere volksbestemming, as burger van my land.

KWELLING

Juis hierdie gegewe, hierdie onomstootlike feit, bring my, as Christen, egter te staan voor 'n eweseer onwegredeneerbare probleem en saal my op met 'n geestekwelling waarvan die nie-Christen en die heiden vermoedelik nie eens bewus is nie.

Vir hom staan dinge so eenvoudig. Laat die emosie inhibisieloos hoogty vier! Laat 'n mens jou met 'n kwasi-jeugdelike argeloosheid hees skreeu oor jou eie span, jou eie groep, jou eie nasie, oor Volk en Vaderland! Daar bestaan in elk geval geen aantrekliker keuse nie. En hoe harder jy skreeu, hoe vertroostender is die veiligheidsin wat voortvloei uit die gesamentlike eenparige gejuig wat opgaan van die eensgesinde massa rondom jou. Dit is alles so maklik, so eenvoudig, so onkompliseerd, so probleemloos.

Vir die opregte Christen, egter, (wat tegelykertyd ook nasieman is, en wil wees) staan die saak ongelukkig anders en is alles nie so eenvoudig nie.

In die eerste plek is hy naamlik verplig om hom daarvoor te bedink dat die menslike emosie gewoonlik hand aan hand gaan met — en dikwels selfs voortvloei uit — menslike eiebelang en selfsug.

Dit geld trouens selfs van 'n bepaalde vorm van die hoogste menslike emosie, die liefde self, en lê aan die wortel van die Nieu-Testamentiese onderskeiding tussen **eros**, die vleeslike of erotiese liefde, en **agapé**, die geestelike of Gees-geïnspireerde liefde.

In 'n heel letterlike sin, naamlik, is dié „liefde“ waarvan ons gewoonweg praat, 'n vleeslike liefde in soverre dit wesenlik ge-

(Vervolg op bladsy 4)

BURGER VAN TWEE WÊRELDE

(Vervolg van bladsy 3)

wortel is in die mens se vleeslike begeerte en in sy selfsugtige eiebelang. Is die liefde tussen 'n man en 'n vrou — altans voordat die Gees van God op die toneel verskyn — nie gebaseer op 'n wesenlik vleeslike begeerte en selfbevredigingsdrang nie? Is my veelal aangeprese liefde vir my ouers nie alte dikwels gewortel in die troosryke versekering van versorging wat hulle my bied nie? En my liefde vir my kind in die vleiende weerspieëling en verlangde voortsetting van myself wat hy verteenwoordig nie? En my vurige en emosie-belaaide liefde vir my land en volk in die behaaglike gevoel van „behorendheid-tot”, in 'n vorm van selfverheerliking op grootse, nasionale, „massa-ek” skaal nie?

Maar nou leer die Skrif my as Christen, juis ten aansien en selfs ten spyte van hierdie „natuurlike” emosionele drange en begeertes, dat ek geroepe is om die dinge van die vlees af te lê en om die dinge van die gees te bedink. En daardeur word ek voor 'n ernstige probleem geplaas, en telkemale weer, onvermydelik, voor 'n bykans onmoontlike keuse: of die maklike, selfbehaaglike weg van ongetemperde emosionele uitlewing (al is dit dan ook op die pseudo-altruïstiese vlak van nasionalistiese volksverheerliking), of die moeilike weg van selfverloënde Christenverantwoordelikheid soos aangedui deur die Heilige Gees self.

Meer nog. Hoewel dit vir die nie-Christen voor die hand liggend is om kommerloos by die selfbehaaglike en selfsugtige, by sporadiese opwellinge van die bloot emosionele te volstaan, weet ek dat Christus, wat ek geroepe is om te volg, aanspraak maak op die **hele** mens in my, en nie slegs op één aspek van my menslikheid, t.w. my emosie nie.

Ek herinner my nog goed dat een van my professore tydens my universiteitsjare teenoor my verklaar het dat elke goeie en waardevolle preek 'n appél moet rig tot ál drie die konstituerende elemente van die menslike gees: die **emosie**, die **rede** en die **wil**. En

dan het hy klaarblyklik nog 'n vierde en laaste een uitgelaat: die **gewete!**

NIE WAAR

Om dan nou terug te keer tot die onlangse Republiekfeesviering en my eie emosionele meelewing met die versamelde skare aan die voet van die Monumentkoppie: hoeveel het ook my rede, my gewete en my wil nou juis met my diepste gewaarwordinge te doen gehad?

Emosioneel kon en het ek my verkeukel oor alles wat dáár gedoen en gesê is, en kon ek my van harte verlustig in die prestasies van die geliefde volk waartoe ek behoort. Maar wat leer my in Christus geheiligde **rede** my nou, na al die opwinding verby is, omtrent dié „prestasies” waaraan ook ek, as lid van my volk, deel het en wat ek dus ook vir myself durf toe-eien?

Dit is nie eens nodig om met vers en kapittel op die hele saak in te gaan nie. Van dié standpunt, van die standpunt van die **rede** gesien, kan daar by my hoegenaamd geen twyfel bestaan nie dat soveel van wat deur my volk en sy leiers oor die afgelope paar dekades heen „presteer” is, nouliks die toets van die mees elementêre logika kan deurstaan: dat so baie wat onder die dekmantel van „redelikheid” gedoen is, eintlik vanuit die staanspoor op 'n groot leuen gebaseer was — al was dit dan ook 'n „wit” leuen, om die wêreld 'n rat voor die oë te draai en die waarheid vir onself te verbloem.

Of ons dit nou vir onself wil erken of nie, **weet** ons as redelike wesens diep in ons hart dat so baie van die dinge wat ons onself, ons nie-blanke landgenote en die res van die wêreld probeer wysmaak, eenvoudig net nie wáár is nie!

En wat van my **gewete** as mens, en veral as Christen? Ek hoef dit sekerlik nouliks vir myself uit te spel dat soveel van wat, ook in my naam, deur my volk en sy leiers reeds verrig is en teen 'n stygende tempo verrig word, wesenlik immoreel is en geensins gemeet durf word aan die eise van werklike Christelike regverdigheid nie.

Ten slotte: my vermoë tot positiewe en Christusgelykvormige **wilsbeslissing** . . .

Moet ek nie veral ook in hierdie opsig, minstens dan teenoor myself, die diepste skuld bely nie? Was my houding en reaksies tydens die onlangse volksfees dan nie juis verteenwoordigend en tipies van my alledaagse houding en reaksies nie: dié van 'n willose berusting in die alte dikwels verkeerde handeling en optrede van my volk, dié van kommerlose beaming van die wesenlik onregverdige, dié van 'n blinde en sorgelose verontagsaming van my Christelike verantwoordelikheid (beide as individu en as lid van my volk) onder die beswyming van 'n emosioneel-nasionalistiese opgesweepteheid?

Dit, dan, is die geesteskwellinge waartoe 'n nabetrugting oor die onlangse Republiekfees aanleiding gee in my eie gees. Dit is die uiters problematiese situasie waarin ek my bevind, bloot omdat ek tegelykertyd 'n volbloed Afrikaner is, en ook, onontwykbaar, 'n Christen. Vir my nie-Christen volksgenoot bestaan hierdie tweespalt, hierdie selfweerspraak, glad nie. Hy is gelukkig en doodtevrede, geseënd met die vraeloosheid en ongekeweldheid van die armes van gees. Vir hom is dit genoeg om lid van die Afrikanervolk te wees en om hom te verlustig in sy oortuigdheid aangaande die onfeilbaarheid van hierdie oënskynlik uitverkore volk; en daarmee basta!

KEUSE

Vir my en my oortuigde mede-Christene is dit nie so eenvoudig nie. Ook óns is Afrikaners in murg en been, en eweseer daartoe geneë om met opwellende emosie saam fees te vier en te juig oor die gemeenskaplike prestasies van ons volk.

Maar ons behoort nie net tot die Afrikanervolk nie. Ons behoort ook tot die volk van God — en staan gevolglik, by alle emosioneel-nasionalistiese vervoering, aangekla deur ons eie rede, ons eie gewete en al die ongebruikte uitdagings en geleenthede tot 'n werklik Christelike wilsbeslissing.

Ons is in-onself-verdeelde burgers van twee wêreldes: landsburgers van die Republiek Suid-Afrika, maar ook burgers van die reeds bestaande Koninkryk van Christus, wat op sy beurt 'n

(Vervolg op bladsy 6)

Inleidingsartikel:

Geweld in Afrika

Die hele beskaafde wêreld is geskok en verontrus deur die uitbarstings van menslike wreedheid, terreur en geweldpleging wat die afgelope weke tot uiting gekom het in die openbare teregstellings in die Kongo, die bloedige botsings in Nigerië, massamoorde in die Soedan en die gewelddadige onderdrukking van politieke teëstanders in verskeie ander Afrikastate. Ons het dit reeds vantevore as oortuiging uitgespreek en wil dit hier nogeens duidelik en onomwonde stel dat geen Christen sodanige dade van geweldpleging ooit kan goedkeur nie. Geen provokasie, hoe ernstig ookal, kan as regverdiging dien vir dergelike uitings van barbarisme en moordlus nie, selfs al hou ons rekening met die feit dat die meeste van hierdie volke nog maar enkele jare gelede in toestande van die grootste primitiwiteit geleef het.

Aan die ander kant pas dit die Westerse volke allermens om in 'n gees van hoogmoed of veroordeling teenoor sulke onmenslike optrede te staan. Wie die geskiedenis van die evolusie van die demokrasie ken, weet met hoeveel bloedvergieting en geweld oor 'n lang tydperk hierdie ontwikkeling gepaard gegaan het. En juis in dié tyd toe dieselfde Westerse demokrasieë hulle beroem het op hulle menslike en kulturele prestasies het die atoombom op Hirosjima, die gaskamers van Nazi-Duitsland, die onmenslike slagting van miljoene mense in die Tweede Wêreldoorlog al die vroom praatjies van beskaafdheid, „Christelikheid“ en menslikheid geloenstraf en ook aan die hoë agting wat die primitiewe volkere van Afrika voorheen vir die Westerse beskawing en kultuur gehad het 'n wrede slag toegedien. 'n Bietjie meer beskeidenheid, 'n bietjie meer gematigdheid (veral ook in Suid-Afrika) om nie so gladweg van ons Christelik-Westerse beskawing te praat nie, sal ons almal goed te pas kom.

Want die waarheid is dat die mag van die kwaad elke mensehart beet het, ongeag of dié hart hom in die liggaam van 'n primitiewe of 'n hoogs-ontwikkelde mens bevind. Beskawing alleen is geen waarborg vir Christelike handeling nie. Vir elke mens, beskaaf of onbeskaaf, kultuurmens of primitiewe mens, is daar net een weg tot die oorwinning van moordlus, onreg en geweld: die aanname van die verlossende lewe in Jesus Christus. Alleen op hierdie fondament kan onreg as onreg erken en verwyder word, kan vertrouwe herstel word, kan menseregte en mensepligte in balans geplaas word en 'n vreedsame menslike saambestaan in vooruitsig gestel word.

Juis daarom is dit so nodig dat elke kerk en elke Christen in Suid-Afrika alles in hulle vermoë moet doen om die Christelike boodskap met geloof, vreugde en krag uit te dra na die verste uithoek van ons land. Geen ander mag het die inherente krag om die stukrag van geweld te breek as hierdie boodskap nie. Geen ander middel is so effektief om die menslike hart te bereik en die menslike lewe te

(Vervolg op bladsy 10)

Editorial:

Violence in Africa

The whole of the civilized world is shocked and perturbed by the eruptions of human cruelty, terror and acts of violence which have manifested themselves during the past few weeks in the public executions in the Congo, the bloody clashes in Nigeria, mass murders in the Sudan and the violent suppression of political adversaries in various other African States. We have already, in the past, expressed our conviction and want to reiterate once again, clearly and bluntly, that no Christian can ever condone such acts of violence. No provocation, however serious, can ever serve as justification for such expressions of barbarism and bloodthirstiness, even though we were to take into account that most of these people lived under the most primitive circumstances only a few years ago.

On the other hand it hardly befits the Western nations to regard such inhuman behaviour in a spirit of superiority and condemnation. He who knows the history of the evolution of democracy also knows how much bloodshed and violence accompanied this development over a long period. And at the very time when these same Western democracies were priding themselves on their human and cultural achievements the atom bomb at Hiroshima, the gas chambers in Nazi Germany, the inhuman slaughter of millions of people during the Second World War, cruelly gave the lie to all pious talk concerning civilization, "Christianity" and humanity, and also harshly shattered the high regard in which the primitive peoples of Africa formerly held Western civilization and culture. A little more modesty, a little more moderation and restraint (especially in South Africa) in our glib prattlings about our Christian Western civilization would surely become us.

For the truth is that the power of evil has a hold upon every human heart, whether this heart finds itself in the body of a primitive or of a highly sophisticated human being. Civilization alone is no guarantee of Christian action. For every human being, civilized or uncivilized, man of culture or primitive man, there is only one way to conquer murderousness, injustice and violence: the acceptance of the saving life in Jesus Christ. On this foundation alone can injustice be recognised as injustice and removed, can trust be restored, can human rights and human duties be placed in proper balance and a peaceful human co-existence be envisioned.

That is why it is so imperative that every church and every Christian in South Africa should do everything in their power to carry the Christian message forth with faith, joy and in all might into the remotest corners of our country. No other might than this message has the inherent power to shatter the driving force of violence. No other medium is so effective in reaching the human heart and in changing human life. And do we Whites who live in South Africa not realise how strongly all responsible

(Continued on page 10)

BURGER VAN TWEE WÊRELDE

(Vervolg van bladsy 4)

vooraftskaduwing is van die komende Koninkryk van God.

Ons, die gekweldes; ons wat onself Christene noem; ons wat slegs onself durf blameer vir die dilemma waarin ons ons bevind, omdat ons uit eie vrye wil die navolgingskap van Christus as 'n lewenspatroon gekies het, ons staan gekonfronteer deur 'n verdeelde lojaliteit, deur dikwels direk uiteenlopende verantwoordelikhede. Ons — anders as ons oënskynlik gelukkiger volksgenote, met slegs hul enkele lojaliteit teenoor „self” en „nasie” — word telkens weer geplaas voor 'n onontwykbare keuse: die keuse tussen vlees en gees, tussen **eros** en **agapé**, tussen self (of massa-self) en Christusnavolging.

En dít is voorwaar geen maklike keuse nie . . .

* * *

Van Christusnavolging en die moeilikheid van ons keuse gepraat, tref dit my by die nalees van hierdie stuk dat **Hy** wie se volgelinge ons strewende om te wees, destyds wesenlik voor dieselfde keuse geplaas is.

Ook **Hy** is, veral op aandrang van sy dissipels (met Judas, die eerste werklike nasionalis in die wêreldgeskiedenis, op die voorpunt) in die versoeking gebring om Volk en Vaderland op die spits te drywe, om die gehate Romeine op hul plek te sit, om die Jodedom tot oorwinning te voer en 'n aardse troon te bestyg — of om die wil van sy Vader te doen . . .

Sy uiteindelijke keuse was 'n baie beslisse en 'n heel duidelike — en het op die lang duur geblyk die regte een te wees, al het die pad waarop dit Hom geplaas het, oor Golgota heen gelei.

SUMMARY

The author — who as an Afrikaner born and bred, could obviously not have written this particular article in anything but his own mother tongue — reflects upon the way in which he himself was, involuntarily, emotionally affected by the recent Festival of the Republic in Pretoria. He dwells upon all the memories evoked by this historical “festival of the people” for him as an “Afrikaner by blood”.

He feels burgeoning within him a justifiable pride at the recollection of all the memorable achievements of his own people.

He asks whether the outside world dare really begrudge the Afrikaner people their national pride — the sporadically emotional, even sentimental, hyper-consciousness of themselves as a unique nation.

He sees no cause for shame in this, nor any reason to apologise to anybody else.

He does, however, detect a grave danger in such an over-stressed nationalist emotionalism for himself as a Christian.

The non-Christian is probably not even aware of this problem, this spiritual stumbling-block. For him everything is so simple and uncomplicated. For him it is merely a matter of Self and Nation or Mass-self — with the comforting security of so many thousands around him, like him, shouting the same reassuring patriotic slogans. The man who, apart from being a proud member of a nation, also happens to be a Christian, has a few very real problems to cope with, however.

Firstly, he must take account of the fact that the natural corollary of emotion, whether patriotic or otherwise, is usually self-interest and selfishness. Even the noblest of emotions, love itself, is, in the Biblical sense of *eros*, a “fleshly”, selfish, self-interested emotion, intent basically upon self-gratification. And is not even one's ardent and frequently emotion-laden love of one's own country and one's people often a selfish love of this type, ultimately intent merely upon the glorification and gratification of the mass-self?

What is more, the Christian dare never be satisfied with a catering for the emotion alone. Christ lays claim to the whole man in him, i.e. also upon his reason, his conscience and his will. All these aspects of his essential humanity must be satisfied for the Christian, even by such a transitory experience as the recent Festival of the Republic. And viewed in this light, grave doubts start coming to the fore.

This recent, greatest of all national festivals of the South African, and specifically the Afrikaner people, provided a surfeit of emotional satisfaction to be sure. But what of the demands of reason as applied to the “achievements” of the Afrikaner people during the past few decades? Surely many of them cannot stand the test of even the most elementary logic. So much of what has been dished up to the world as eminently “reasonable” has been based on a lie. We know in our heart of hearts that so much of that concerning which we have been trying to convince even ourselves, simply is not true!

And what of our Christian conscience? — the author asks. Are so many of the things recently done by my people and enacted by its leaders not basically immoral and unjust?

And as regards my power to make a decision of the will: how often have I not simply let things pass, acquiesced, turned a blind eye to the injustices perpetrated by those whom I still regard as my own?

All these considerations cannot but place me in the gravest of quandaries.

cast as I am in my dual rôle as devoted member of my people and as a practising Christian. I am a creature of divided and conflicting loyalties: a citizen of two worlds. And I am placed before an ineluctable choice: between the flesh and the spirit, *eros* and *agapé*, the (mass-) self and following Christ . . .

Come to think of it, Christ himself was, in his time, confronted by this selfsame choice: his disciples (with Judas, the first real nationalist in history, at their head) clamouring for an earthly kingdom with all its emotional nationalist trappings, as against his duty and loyalty to the Father.

His choice was a completely decisive one, and ultimately to be proven the eternally correct one — even though the way he chose passed over Golgotha.

PRO VERITATE

Verskyn elke 15de van die maand.

Korrespondensie en Administrasie:

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

Redaksionele Bestuur:

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

Assistent-redakteur:

Dr. B. Engelbrecht.

Redakteur:

Ds. C. F. B. Naudé.

Intekengeld vooruitbetaalbaar:

LAND EN SEEPOS: R1 (10/- of \$1.40) — Afrika.
R1.50 (15/- of \$2.10) — Oorsee.
LUGPOS: R2.00 (£1 of \$2.80) — Afrika.
R3.50 (£1-17-6 of \$5.00) — Oorsee.

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

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

LET WEL

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

PURSuing DEAD DOGS AND FLEAS

AN OPINION ON THE CHRISTIAN INSTITUTE

(1 SAMUEL 24:14)

DR. CALVIN COOK

Some at present are questioning whether the Christian Institute's existence is expedient. It was born of strife, they say: it perpetuates dissension. Others, more radically raise the question of the right of the Institute to exist at all. "By what authority", they ask "are you doing these things?"

It is of course quite proper to ask "by what authority". Unlike religions which tolerate the existence of rivals, biblical religion must question because it is concerned with the truth. Where others can use pious frauds or allow rivals to co-exist with their gods, biblical religion challenges every existing or new spiritual phenomenon with the claim that in no other name is there salvation. But such a challenge can only be issued in terms of the truth. It has nothing to do with the degree of political authority that may lie behind those who ask the question. And when Christians have made political power the final arbiter in such judgement, despite the religious phraseology which may have been used, the result is always simply a political judgment. The judgment will only be according to the Spirit when truth is the criterion. Of themselves, political decisions tell nothing certainly about the question of truth: whenever the balances of power change they are reversed. Without ever realizing what was at stake spiritually Pharaoh first made and then reversed a number of political judgments. The problem of the prophet was how to prevent his opponents from judging in terms of their superior political power issues that in the end had to be settled in terms of righteousness and truth.

Further, whenever the question "by what authority" is asked, it raises not only the right of the questioned, but of the questioner. The questioner must also establish his right to ask. When the question was asked the first time (Mark 11.27ff) Jesus questions his questioners' right and capacity to judge by referring to the origins of John the Baptist's ministry: from heaven or from men? Then because they tried to answer this in political terms by refusing a reply, he then refused to answer their question. Since the two ministries had one origin, those who had not acknowledged the authority of the one would

not acknowledge the authority of the other. By the way they approached their own answer, the questioners forfeited their right to a reply and further revealed their own lack of spiritual credentials. Nothing that turns finally upon spiritual discernment can be settled by political juggling. When Cardinal Sadolet addressed the same question to the citizens of Geneva, Calvin's reply stated classically the issues involved when one group of Christians questions the right of another to exist. For this question always involves the credentials of the questioner as well as those of the questioned.

HISTORICAL ORIGINS OF CHRISTIAN INSTITUTE

A new ministry that claimed to be the work of God was the occasion for the question first being asked. It arises whenever there is a new ministry that makes similar claims. Because the Institute claims to be doing what it does in the name of Christ it now raises the same question. In considering the credentials of the Institute we must therefore take into account historical origins and spiritual significance.

First then, the historical origins. For years, the churches in this country have been concerned about the character of their witness and fellowship. Whenever the gospel is preached, a community results. What marks distinguish this community of the gospel from human associations based say on race, culture or language? When the community arises in a multi-racial country, the resultant questions about the nature of the church and of its life become exceedingly complex.

Further, because the church has a responsibility to Christ not to live for itself but to preach the gospel to every creature, its life must be determined by this work. This commission has to be carried out in

particular historical circumstances, to the people who happen to be there at that time and as they are. The community thus formed is always full of unresolved tensions between the new forms and the old: these are resolved through life together. People enter the church with pre-Christian habits of mind and life. These associations may continue to influence them profoundly despite their baptism into Christ. In all, sanctification is a life-long process which is never completed in any before death. The question of the distinctive marks and direction of Christian fellowship arises in many details: the issue is always our acceptance of others because Christ has accepted us. But no one makes the proper response of love fully or immediately. Classically in Galatia the occasion of facing this issue was over Jews and Gentiles eating together. It was settled in terms that exalted association with Christ over all other loyalties and associations. Whatever a man had been before he was in Christ, he was now to be accepted fully as a member of the body of Christ and for Christ's sake. The source of this new association was Christ and his Holy Spirit; one of its manifestations was in the physical terms of eating and drinking together. This activity broke through an hitherto unassailable barrier and formed a new community.

The study of the implications of the gospel for community and for society in this country had already engaged denominations working independently of one another. The Nederduitse Gereformeerde Kerk (N.G.K.) had set an example to the rest in great studies of poverty and the effects of urbanization. Occasionally, as within the Christian Council, denominations had studied these matters together. By 1954, however, the various denominations had gradually realized that these concerns were not the peculiar problem of particular denominations, but were common to all Christians. Further, since earlier attempts to have apartheid promulgated as scriptural dogma had failed, there was room for Christians

(Continued on page 8)

Pursuing Dead Dogs and Fleas

(Continued from page 7)

of different races and different denominations to meet one another to discuss their common responsibilities as Christians. Accordingly, in November, 1954, the first of a number of inter-church conferences was held in Pretoria.

Some time later, the World Council of Churches began a study programme entitled "Christian responsibility in areas of rapid social change". Originally limited to Latin America and Asia, it soon became obvious that Africa should also be involved. An inter-church committee was established to carry out this study locally. This committee's work led to the arrangement of an inter-church conference at Cottesloe in 1960. For a fortnight, ten representatives from each of the then 8 member churches of the World Council met to seek agreement on what practical steps might express Christian responsibility at this present time. The publication of the Tomlinson report provided an unprecedented wealth of statistics and suggestions as a background for such a study.

Though at the end of the conference the Hervormde Kerk dissociated itself from the findings, the other seven churches' representatives agreed to submit a 15 point programme to their ruling bodies. The programme was not radical in itself; its novelty lay rather in the width of consensus that had been achieved. Some hitherto final barriers had been broken down. The conference showed what could happen if men allowed themselves to be led by the Spirit; its sequel in the failure of the churches to endorse the programme on which their leaders had agreed demonstrated the tragedy of the contemporary church in South Africa. In the end, political associations worked more powerfully than spiritual. Thus for instance, when the two N.G.K. synods that had participated in the conference were faced with a choice between the spiritual commitments of their leaders to other churches and church union on the basis of racial brotherhood, they chose the bond of flesh and blood rather than of the Spirit. However important the federation of the N.G.K. Synods may yet prove to be it is a federation that can be accounted for sociolog-

ically. The price paid for this achievement was the breakdown of the spiritual relationships between Churches so wonderfully established at Cottesloe. While in principle therefore such a reunion could be welcomed by all, the circumstances in which it finally came about certainly gave the appearance of displaced priorities: not as serious perhaps as making the forgiveness of sins subserve Fugger fund-raising, but a displacement nevertheless.

It is not fair to regard the N.G.K. as the villain of the piece. A church is greater than its Synod. In any case, the real tragedy lies in the fact that the N.G.K. is a victim and the rest of the churches losers through this decision. Its withdrawal from ecumenical activity impoverishes all. The church was itself revived through ecumenical influences in the last century. The Trekkers owed much to Lindley; Scots ministers studied in Holland in order to prepare for ministries in South Africa. Andrew Murray's influence was not only country, but world-wide; N.G.K. missionaries have served conspicuously throughout Africa. Yet this church now finds itself unwilling to associate with others who are not of its own nationality and apparently afraid to allow that self-examination and criticism of belief and practice which is indispensable to a reformed church. Nor is this the end: some are urging that anyone who questions this xenophobic trend should be expelled from office if not also from membership. But why should it be unchristian to suggest that the ministry of the church is to the world, and that it must be ready to receive into its fellowship whomever the Spirit may add? Most seriously of all, how does it indicate to the world the fact that its membership is not identical with a racial political party?

RESPONSE TO FAILURE

The Christian Institute arose as a response to this historic failure of the churches to be the church. Its founders hoped that Christians could pursue as individuals the work begun by the leaders of the church even though the churches had officially desisted from it. Apart from this failure, the Institute would never have been formed because there would have been no need for it to exist. But since this failure has happened, no denomination has

now the right to deny the right of the Institute to exist. Its occasion for existence lies in the failure of the churches to continue the work of Christ which they began together; its right, that this work needs to be done. The churches and their leaders must ask themselves whether having put their hands to this plough, and having looked back, they are still fit for the Kingdom of God.

Mercifully, such is the patience of God, that when councils fail, the Spirit turns to smaller groups and uses them. Every reformation of the church has begun through small groups that have continued to work together despite official disparagement or persecution. **Such groups of course have their dangers. They can over-estimate their importance or comprehension; they can become victims of spiritual pride. Yet these dangers do not themselves mean that the groups ought not to exist at all: the dangers are common to all spiritual activity.** No denomination, itself only a part of the church and not the whole has a right to question the right of such groups to exist for the same reason that the denomination itself exists: to contribute something to the life of the church as a whole that this would otherwise lack. The right of the N.G.K. to exist, for instance, lies firstly in the fact that God called the reformation into being, and then raised up this group in this country as part of his people. Likewise, the right of the Institute lies finally in the fact that it has been called to serve Christ in a way no other denomination is doing or can do. It must continue this work until the churches themselves by their own reformation and co-operation render the form of this work unnecessary. **Redundancy is not among the arguments advanced against the Institute: it cannot be. No church at present provides a fellowship that is open both racially and inter-denominationally.** This the Institute seeks to do because it believes that in these present circumstances such openness is part of the witness of Christians to the gospel. If such openness is the cause of dissatisfaction, then it can only say: we have not so learned Christ. We can only urge that there is something essentially un-Christian about inter-racial meetings or inter-denominational meetings if we first ignore all there is in the scripture to the

contrary and if we also sanctify dubious and temporary political and ecclesiastical conditions. Yet is it not precisely these attempts to solidify contemporary conditions into immortal and eternal images that is the essence of idolatry?

THE REAL OBJECTION

For the question must be asked: is not the real objection to the work of the Institute the fact that by its very existence it draws attention to defects in Christian fellowship in this country and to the failure of the churches to be the church? However, where the people of God and their leaders fail to measure up to his requirements and he in his mercy sends a prophetic word to them, they can do nothing worse than attempt to suppress such a word. We believe that in present circumstances, the Institute is such a word.

It is easy enough to point out the human defects of any of God's messengers, save the Son, and to think that because we may have won the argument *ad hominem* that he is no better than we that we have dealt with the judgment of God he bears. **The Institute cannot be accused of dividing the church or even Christians: Christians and the churches were divided long before the Institute was formed, and these divisions, which have nothing to do with the Institute seem to have even longer prospects than the Institute. But denominations cannot properly veto individual members from doing that which they have themselves already recognized as proper for Christians and for churches.** For where denominations show themselves officially unconcerned with the unity of the church or aspects of its mission, they also show themselves to be concerned more with their own wills, purposes and existence than with the command of Christ. Such attitudes are of course not peculiar to our country or time; nor is it unprecedented that people should defend such preoccupations. But how can we accept as normative for the church of God that it should obey men rather than God?

The fact is that Christians ought to be doing certain things together in this country which at the present time they are not. They ought to be meeting for prayer and study of the scriptures. The work of Cottesloe needs to be resumed by the churches themselves. That conference made Christians face one another in a way

that shook all concerned to their spiritual roots: they met one another in person as well as in print. This process now needs to be carried into the churches themselves. Each needs to be challenged in an inescapable way with the correctness and comprehensiveness of its faith. We need to be led into taking decisions that are no longer determined more by our previously established political positions than by where the Spirit has led us in conversation with our fellow Christians. We need to face constantly whether we are allowing cultural and other considerations to triumph over Christ as the basis of our fellowship.

IMPASSE

The failure of churches to move on from Cottesloe has produced a tragic impasse. The distinctive notes of the gospel, that it, of repentance and faith have been drowned by re-creation. We do not see repentance and faith as that which carries us out beyond the safe harbours of our denominational life. Therefore it should not surprise us that we are unable to state with clarity or that which carries conviction with others, the true nature of our association in Christ, or of how this association is to be distinguished or exalted above human associations. Because we refuse to make such a change ourselves, our theologies become self-justifications. We turn a supposed order of creation into a defence of the status quo. We give it precedence over our redemption in Christ. We banish eschatology to the end of time as if the Kingdom were not already here at all. We make the cross of Christ of none effect because there is no difference between those who claim to be carrying the cross and those who make no pretence at doing so. We allow the name of Christians to those who have not submitted themselves to the radical transformation of character implied in discipleship. The courts are trampled, the sacrifices made, days are kept, and worshippers are left complacently thinking that all God's requirements have been met, and that their miserable poverty of spirit is the fulness of God. Meanwhile our churches can be studied as cultural associations that confirm rather than shake the prejudice of atheist sociologists. Where does he find a single miracle of reconciliation that he cannot parallel from the works of some secular magician?

APPEARANCE AND CALLING

There is a question that needs to be asked about the Christian Institute: will it be able to do a task that properly belongs to the whole church, and particularly when the churches persist in lacking the will to continue? The answer here is surely that God is not deceived by appearances; nor does he allow himself to be thwarted by human disobedience. He raised the New Israel up to achieve that which the Old would not; this process he has repeated throughout the history of the church. Every denomination traces its ancestry to some such refusal on the part of men and a corresponding action on the part of God. Thus if any in the name of Christ presumes to prohibit Christians from meeting with Christians, he is liable to forfeit his own name. While such prohibitions may be argued on grounds of social or political expediency, they cannot be justified in the name of Christ. To suggest otherwise is to run the film of salvation history backwards; in this case to regress to pre-reformation Rome by imagining that questions of theological truth can be settled simply by the exercise of ecclesiastical powers for political purposes. Such an approach settles nothing; it only raises afresh the right of the power itself. The reformation itself bars such an approach — though this in itself has seldom prevented churches of the reformation from at least attempting this short cut.

POSITIVE AND NEGATIVE

Given such beginnings, associations such as the Christian Institute always have a positive and a negative aspect in their beginnings together with an equivocal existence. They have a distinct purpose to fulfil; yet that purpose arises from the failure of the existing community of disciples. For despite human failure, God does not leave himself without a witness; he brings into being things that do not exist to confound those which do. Later these things are recognized thankfully as parts of his saving purpose. **There could hardly be a greater tragedy for this continent as a whole if at this time the slender connexion between churches should be completely broken and they lapse into an autonomy of damnation that**

(Continued on page 10)

Pursuing Dead Dogs and Fleas

(Continued from page 9)

failed to discern the whole body. The Institute and other inter-denominational agencies remind denominations that beyond their own life, which always gravitates towards self-centredness (which is not the same as self-sufficiency), is the rest of the body that we ignore to our loss and peril.

The significance of such groups is seldom seen at the time and rarely judged correctly. Protagonists will overestimate and antagonists underestimate their importance. **The Institute will not displace the church; it may however be used to shake denominations. It may also enable Christians who are divided from one another by historical circumstances to come to a fuller understanding of the riches of Christ than is possible from living completely within denominational limits.** This is not only a reasonable and worthy hope. We believe it is also a Christian aim. The Institute will eventually have to be judged as to whether it has succeeded in this task. The standard will be whether it has lived by the righteousness of faith or whether it has relapsed into some other un-Christian form of like-mindedness. Likewise its opponents will be judged by the same standard, and by what they have done by other means to achieve the same purpose. For, it cannot be over-emphasised, the dispute is about means not purposes.

Meanwhile the Institute must call forth opposition from those who for whatever reasons resent this kind of activity. Perhaps for a couple of decades it may be possible to continue arguing that because churches have hitherto managed without these activities they do not need them now. Others may suggest that such activities are not spiritually motivated but have sinister political sources. Since the Christian faith was responsible for breaking open the tribal oysters of Israel and then of Europe, they have good reason to believe and fear that it will do the same in Africa. Therefore those who for whatever reasons wish to keep the tribal oyster-shell intact and shut naturally oppose this work. But in doing so are they not opposing a far greater antagonist than the Institute, Christ Himself?

Both the supporters of the Institute and its opponents need to be reminded of Gamaliel's warning: if this thing is of God, then those who oppose it will oppose not men, but God. If it is simply of men, and particularly of disappointed or disgruntled men, it will disappear. What makes such a judgment difficult is precisely the equivocal nature of the evidence: there are defects in this work; there are achievements and possibilities. David's monarchy was founded upon divine anointing which few were in a position to witness and upon Adullamites, that many were able to despise. Gamaliel wisely recognized that though ecclesiastical authorities could make life unpleasant for leaders of the upstart sect, and could even kill them, any movement initiated by God could not be crushed in this way. The church has had similar difficulties in recognizing the legitimacy of wisdom's children. It will seem strange in half a century, or when the books of heaven are opened on this era of our history to find churches having persecuted their members for practising what in principle the churches themselves approved and began themselves to practice, and doing so moreover not because the grounds or need for these activities had changed, but simply because their mood had changed from faith to fear. Cats display similar moodiness towards caught mice, but who suggests that this shows the mind of Christ?

GEWELD IN AFRIKA

(Vervolg van bladsy 5)

verander nie. En besef ons blankes wat in Suid-Afrika woon dan nie hoe sterk alle verantwoordelike leiers van die nie-blanke bevolking ook hulle medeafkeuring in geweld as middel tot verwesenliking van hulle aspirasies uitgespreek het nie? Juis daarom is dit die heilige en dure plig van elke Christen en elke kerk om vas te stel wat die struikelblokke is wat die aanname en vrugbare deurwerking van die Evangelie in die harte van die mense van Afrika verhinder en alles in hulle vermoë te doen om hierdie hindernisse uit die weg te ruim as ons nie wil hê dat geweld uiteindelik as enigste alternatief

deur die massas in hulle frustrasie aangegryp word nie. Talle van kerk- en Christenleiers wat in noue verbintenis met die nie-blanke leef en werk het herhaaldelik beweerd dat die apartheidsbeleid een van die grootste faktore is wat besig is om ontsettende en onberekenbare skade aan die uitbreiding van die Evangelie te berokken. As hierdie stelling deur eerlike en onbevange ondersoek bevestig word (en ons het nie die minste twyfel dat dit sal gebeur nie), dan moet dit gesê word — duidelik, onomwonde en onbevrees — en moet die weg gevolg word wat Christus vir Sy kerk en Sy kinders aandui. Want alleen in die navolging van dié weg kan Kerk, staat en gemeenskap die seën van die Here te wagte wees.

VIOLENCE IN AFRICA

(Continued from page 5)

leaders of the non-White population have also expressed their deprecation, together with us, of violence as a means towards the realisation of their aspirations?

For this very reason it is the solemn and ineluctable duty of every Christian and every church to determine what the stumbling-blocks are which are preventing the fruitful permeation of the Gospel into the hearts of the people of Africa and to do everything in their power to remove these obstacles if we do not wish violence ultimately to be seized upon as the only alternative by the masses in their frustration. Numerous church and Christian leaders who live and work in close contact with non-Whites have repeatedly alleged that the policy of apartheid is one of the prime factors causing the most appalling and incalculable damage to the spread of the Gospel. If this statement be confirmed by honest and unbiased investigation (and we do not doubt for a moment that this is bound to happen), then it must be stated — clearly, bluntly and fearlessly — and the way must be followed which Christ indicates to his Church and his children. For only as we follow this way the church, state and community could be assured of the blessing of the Lord.

THEOLOGY IN THE CRUCIBLE

THE REV. JAMES MOULDER

(The first part of this article appeared in the May edition of *Pro Veritate*. In the first part of this article the author contended that while there was a division according to pigmentation and culture among the people south of the Limpopo, they nevertheless found themselves in the crucible where the Potter is forming one nation, a **volk**, South Africans.

The alienation which exists between the groups need to be overcome and for this to happen discussions on basic presuppositions are necessary. The author proceeds to begin such a discussion on the basis of Prof. F. A. van Jaarsveld's book, "The Afrikaans Interpretation of South African History".

The author of the article sees four problems and ideals with the firms of these in the first part of this article. How will the Church distinguish between its own theological utterances and the ideological utterances of Afrikaner political leaders? This problem arises because both theologian and Afrikaner leader claim that God acted in history. While acknowledging the formal similarities the author points to four striking differences in the two claims:

- (i) Theologians emphasise that God was concerned about all men; Afrikaner leaders emphasise God's concern for the Afrikaners;
- (ii) theologians proclaim a world-wide Church as God's "called"; Afrikaner leaders proclaim a parochial ethnic group as God's "called";
- (iii) theologians see a task on behalf of all who are not (yet) members of the Church; Afrikaner leaders on behalf of Afrikaners only, or on behalf of the "fair";
- (iv) theologians witness that loyalty to Jesus is supreme; Afrikaner leaders in witnessing to the loyalty to the Afrikanerdom are ambiguous and suggest that this loyalty is sometimes superior to a loyalty to Jesus.

There is a conflict between the claims of the theologian and the Afrikaner leader, but as neither of them can advance empirical, secular evidence that God has participated in these events, some criteria are necessary on which a judgement can be made as to the validity of the claims. The author suggests such a criteria should be moral ones. The claims must be evaluated 'by the fruits they bear' (Matt. 7:15-20).

The author now proceeds to investigate three specific concepts of Afrikaner ideology which are in conflict with the Church's theology).

APARTHEID OR HOLINESS?

Perhaps the most important point in Prof. van Jaarsveld's essays is that the so-called 'racial problem' south of the Limpopo has 'a religious core' (p 23). He maintains that 'there exists a belief that the Afrikaners have a 'calling' from God to effect the **separation** of white and black to the end that the whites may 'permanently' be able to fulfil their 'calling' and, amongst others, quotes Prof. H. G. Stoker's thesis that the Afrikaners' 'refusal to make a concession (of the franchise to non-whites) is also religious in its essence and relates to our firm belief in the calling to which God has summoned us here in South Africa' (p 24). This, roughly, is the ideological basis of **apartheid**, of racial separateness, 'parallel development', 'autochthonous development'.

Once again we are skating on the thin ice which divides the theology of the Church from the ideology of the Afrikaner. The root meaning of **qadosh** (Hebrew for 'holy' 'saints', 'holy ones') and **hagios** (Greek for 'holy', 'saints', 'holy ones') is that which is **separate**, that which, because of its association with God, 'the holy one of Israel', is cut off or separated from all profane contact or use. Furthermore, both the Jews and the Church are a holy, a separated people because of their encounter with the holy one of Israel, the God and Father of our Lord, Jesus Christ. Because of this priests, prophets and apostles alike often had to remind the proto-Church — Israel — and the Church of Jesus Christ that they were different from those who were not members of the Church, not associated with the holy one of Israel.

Thus there is a **formal** similarity between the theological concept 'holiness' and the ideological concept 'apartheid'; between the Biblical admonitions to the 'saints' and

Die Transvaler's admonition to Afrikaners who, it is argued, believe that 'the Supreme Being brought (them) to this country by divine purpose' (p 24). But whereas the Biblical record constantly insists that both Israel and the Church's holiness, separateness or **apartheid** must be understood and manifested in moral terms, Afrikaner leaders seldom argue that the Afrikaner people's **apartheid** from other ethnic groups must be understood in any but racial terms.

More specifically, the pattern for Israel's holiness is nothing less than the holy one of Israel — 'You shall be holy; for I the Lord your God am holy' (Leviticus 19:2). The books **Jonah** and **Ruth** decisively challenge the notion that it is racial purity or **apartheid** which is the holiness God demands from his people. And in the New Testament Jesus and his apostles proclaim a Gospel in which the racial and cultural differences between Jews and Greeks, Samaritans and Romans, are irrelevant to membership of the Church. In contrast to this Afrikaner leaders' utterances on **apartheid** indicate that it is a racial concept; that the separation which it effects between people is not based on belief but on birth and breeding; that it is dependant, not on God's grace, but on man's genes. The specific difference being that, whereas **any** member of the human race who believes in Jesus Christ and experiences God's grace is a member of the Church, **no** member of the human race who is not born and bred an Afrikaner, who does not have Afrikaner genes, is a member of Afrikanerdom.

Thus theologians south of the Limpopo must insist — as some of them have done — that, in spite of **formal** similarities between **apartheid** and holiness, the former has no place in the life, worship, preaching or teaching of the Church because it contradicts the very foun-

(Continued on page 12)

Theology in the Crucible

(Continued from page 11)

dation of the Gospel — namely, the message of salvation into the Church by faith and grace alone. Furthermore: theologians have to insist that the 'holy ones', the Church, cannot accept the moral and cultural standards of any ethnic group, not even the Afrikaner's, as a guide for the Church's faith and order, life and work. The reason for this is simple: the 'holy ones' are also foolish ones who follow God's Fool via the 'sheer folly' of weakness and the cross — a stumbling block and folly not only to Jews and Greeks but to the power politicians and ideological leaders of Africans, Afrikaners, Asians, Coloured and Englishmen alike. (1 Corinthians 1:18-31).

BAASSKAP OR LORDSHIP?

Prof. van Jaarsveld not only locates the 'religious core' of the 'South African problem', he also observes that whereas earlier leaders emphasised that Afrikaners were God's instruments 'to carry the light of the Gospel to the heathen in South Africa' the emphasis at present is "increasingly shifted from 'Evangelical' and 'Christian' civilization to the preservation of the white man." (p 25). Thus Dr. H. F. Verwoerd has argued that 'South Africa has a **greater** task than that of establishing Christian civilization in Africa. It must become the firm basis for the **white man** when he has his back to the wall from which he can again advance.' (p 25).

This argument is ambiguous in the way already referred to. It suggests that loyalty to a particular genetic manifestation — namely, 'whiteness' (actually, 'off-whiteness' as anyone knows who has ever compared the colour of his skin with the colour of his sheets!) — is in some unspecified way more important than loyalty to Jesus Christ. Faced with this type of argument there is not much Christians can do: except confess that we have only one **Baas** and take the consequences, knowing that this Jesus who died the death of a common criminal God raised "to the heights and bestowed on him the name above all names, that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow — in heaven,

on earth, and in the depths — and every tongue confess, 'Jesus Christ is Lord', to the glory of God the Father" (Philippians 2:5-11).

Furthermore: because Jesus Christ is **Baas** nobody else is whatever his birth, breeding, brains, beauty or bank-balance may be. In his Church there is, therefore, no justification for any discrimination or distinction between his followers on the basis of these criteria. In other words: if anyone wants to be a follower of this Jesus he cannot be one until he recognises that all the other followers of Jesus, the 'fair' as well as the 'dark' ones, are equally servants of the one **Baas**. And this means that the Church of Christ cannot care a damn whether 'whiteness' is preserved or not, whether the men and women who live south of the Limpopo are 'fair', 'dark' or 'coffee-coloured'. The Church has been called by God to proclaim the Gospel of Grace, not to waste its time over genes and genealogies.

CRISIS OR JUDGEMENT

Afrikaner leaders often emphasize that we are in a 'crisis situation'. Observing this, Prof. van Jaarsveld wonders "whether the 'calling' is an existential manifestation. When the Afrikaners need encouragement or comfort in difficult situations are they not likely to deceive themselves by falling back on convenient slogans?" (p 26). Warning against this he quotes **Die Burger** on the subject — 'it is an extremely uncomfortable business to have a calling since that involves responsibility and sacrifice'.

Die Burger is right but needs to go further. 'Crisis' is a Biblical word — in fact, nothing but the actual Greek word for 'judgement'. Thus a crisis situation is not Dr. Verwoerd's 'back to the wall' situation; it is not a cry to man the panic stations; but an awareness of God's presence in history as Saviour and Judge. And God's judgement on us is not merely given on a final Day of the Lord, but here and now — 'the unbeliever has already been judged in that he has not given his allegiance to God's only Son. Here lies the test: the light has come into the world, but men preferred darkness to light because their deeds were evil'. (John 3:18-21).

Furthermore: prophets like Amos remind us that God's judgement is not based on genetic criteria but on his law — the people of Israel cannot appeal to their Jewishness in

the Assyrian or Babylonian 'crisis'. And in the New Testament God's law is proclaimed in terms of love, of neighbourliness, and practical helpfulness and concern — for example, as in the parable of the Good Samaritan (Luke 10:25-37).

Yes, Afrikaner leaders are right. There is a 'crisis' in Southern Africa. God is judging each one of us.

'He is sifting out the hearts of men before His judgement-seat.

O be swift, my soul, to answer Him; be jubilant my feet! Our God is marching on.'

But Afrikaner leaders are wrong in maintaining that in this 'crisis' God is concerned with our racial differences. The fact is — and theologians must say so clearly — that God is indifferent to our 'fairness' and 'darkness'. He will not lift a finger to preserve a 'white' skin. The present rule by the 'fair' is not a sign of God's favour or assistance but merely of a temporary technological, economic and political advantage, nothing of which to boast in God's presence. And as always: when 'the time has come for judgement to begin' it begins 'with God's own household' — the Church (1 Peter 4:17).

YOU HYPOCRITE!

Having examined the ideological utterances of Afrikaner leaders on **apartheid**, **baasskap** and 'crisis', I expect the kind of reaction contained in **Die Volksblad** to criticisms of Afrikanerdom — 'the Boer people has been dragged, found guilty and given a sentence of doom' (p 23).

The indignation in those words is righteous — but not the supporting arguments which I leave unquoted. Throughout the writing of these words I have been reminded of the words of my **Baas**, one greater than **Die Volksblad** — 'You hypocrite! First take the plank out of your own eye, and then you will see clearly to take the speck out of your (Afrikaner) brother's (Matthews 7:1-5).

I am guilty. And so are my African, Asian, Coloured and English brothers and their leaders. And of exactly the same failure as that of my Afrikaner brothers and their leaders — the failure to distinguish between the theology of the Church and our private and corporate ideologies. All of us south of the Limpopo — including the writer of these words — are very much like those men Peter describes —

'springs that give no water, mists driven by a storm . . . they utter big, empty words, . . . a bait to catch those who have barely begun to escape from their heathen environment. They promise them freedom, but are themselves slaves of their own corruption; for a man is the slave of whatever has mastered him. They had once escaped the world's defilements through the knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ; yet . . . they have entangled themselves in these all over again, and are mastered by them . . .' (2 Peter 2:17-22).

But the fact that we are all guilty does not mean that we have to be silent or that we can only shrug our shoulders and hang our head in shame. Remember: we are in a crisis situation; we are being judged by the King of Kings and Lord of Lords. And when the Judge appears so does the Saviour. We may, we must repent. All of us, not merely the Afrikaners and their leaders.

After all, one of the flames which kindled Afrikaner nationalism was English jingoism and imperialism. And now Africans are lighting their nationalistic torches by the flames of the Afrikaner's. We are all to blame for the crisis in the crucible. Unfortunately the utterances of those African, Asian and Coloured leaders that reflect similar or different ideological perversions of the Church's theology which we have noticed in the utterances of Afrikaner leaders may not be quoted. But if your memory of the 1950's is a good one or if you have access to the newspapers of that period you can soon verify for yourself this confusion of theology with ideology, of holiness with **apartheid**, of the Lordship of Christ with the **baasskap** of an ethnic group, of a judgement with a panic situation.

NAUGHTY IN COMFORT

Nor are Englishmen south of the Limpopo exempt from this process of perverting the theology of the Church. Our — I accept that I am one of them — brand of perversion is, however, more subtle. Partly because of being culturally more secular than religious; partly because of not having produced any non-Afrikaner leader with the sort of numerical and personal following commanded by a Malan, a Strijdom or a Verwoerd, we are characterised

more by our attitudes than our utterances. But these attitudes nevertheless reflect a set of presuppositions or anxieties which are no less contrary to the theology of the Church than those so far examined.

Firstly, we have a sneaky suspicion that God too is an Englishman and desires that the whole human race be recreated in an English image. Thus conformity with English social and cultural standards is the criterion for African, Asian and Coloured political and ecclesiastical advancement.

Secondly, although we are less convinced that God works via human genes we have few doubts, if any, that he is committed to an economic and educational evolution. We have put our faith in 'gradualism' rather than in 'genetics' and are often oblivious to the fact that we are in a crisis, a judgement situation, where God is asking not that we 'evolve' but that we repent. Thus our stumbling block is the absolute demands of a God who expects to be obeyed here and now and not sometime, somewhere, gradually, after an evolutionary process, perhaps.

Thirdly, we shy away from talk of 'suffering' and 'sacrifice'. We are pragmatists and believe in compromise — 'live and let live', we say. We do not like to be regarded as fools or fanatics and so we find it difficult to follow God's Fool to the cross. And we interpret his teaching in utilitarian terms so that we can get around the 'sheer folly' of taking him seriously.

In a nut-shell: if African and Afrikaner leaders prevent the Church's theology by seriously misapplying some of the Gospel's key concepts to the point of self-deification then English leaders pervert it by not seriously applying these concepts at all.

BEFORE THE COCK CROWS THRICE . . .

By now it should be clear that the Church south of the Limpopo has a tremendous theological task to do — a task that is further complicated by the fact that what is true of African, Afrikaner, Asian, Coloured and English politicians, leaders and people is too often also true of theologians and Christians.

Firstly, we Christians are in danger of losing our theological integrity. We seem oblivious to the

fact that theology is the **logos** (Word) of **theos** (God); that when the Church's theology is perverted by politicians, leaders, people or churchmen God himself is portrayed in a perverted way, is made to look absurd by being proclaimed either as a prisoner of socio-economic forces or as a racist. The first task theologians have is to defend the integrity of 'the Faith once delivered to all the saints' against all its perverters.

Secondly, we Christians are in danger of destroying the holiness of the Church. When all the excuses and explanations we advance have been filed the fact remains that the Church of Christ south of the Limpopo reflects by her denominational, racial and cultural divisions the teachings of the ideologists rather than the teaching of her **Baas**. Furthermore: we are failing to decisively challenge the ideology of **apartheid** because we are afraid of the Government, of losing members, of losing money. In fact we seem to be afraid of everyone — except God; of losing everything — except our integrity. This is why judgement must begin with God's own household. We have polluted the Broken Bread and Poured out Wine which symbolize our salvation by administering them in Churches organized on the basis of breeding and genes instead of Belief and Grace. The ideological leaders are perverting the Gospel: their perverted slogans are not, however, going to be challenged or refuted by the words of the Church, but only by her witness, her Holy Unity. The third task theologians have is to remind God's own household that the Gospel of Jesus is not proclaimed primarily in words, but in deeds.

Thirdly, we Christians are in danger of disowning the **Baasskap** of Jesus by our lack of loyalty to him. Some theologians sometimes complain that religious liberty is being undermined in South Africa — at the Wilgespruit Fellowship Centre, for example. And so it is: but what are we going to do about it? The authorities know: Nothing. Why? Because we have another **baas** than Jesus — expediency, the security police, being sensible, call it what you like. Thus the third task theologians have is to proclaim in words and by example that the followers of Jesus have no other **Baas** but him and are not going to

(Continued on page 14)

Theology in the Crucible

(Continued from page 13)

ask anybody's permission to be loyal to him and to live, worship, and study as he commanded.

Fourthly, we Christians are in danger of panicking in the situation we are in instead of submitting ourselves to God's judgement. Let's face it: we are a useless lot, no better than those who are openly pervert-

ing the theology of the Church. But we should also know that we and all men everywhere 'have one to plead our cause with the Father, Jesus Christ, and he is just. He is himself the remedy for the defilement of our sins, not our sins only but the sins of all the world . . . but . . . if we claim to be sinless, we are self-deceived and strangers to the truth' (1 John 1:1-7, 17). The final task theologians have is to proclaim that there is **hope** in the crucible; that the Potter is not only our Judge but also our Saviour; that he not only breaks our pride and

smashes our tin-gods but makes us into something new.

But all this happens **within** the crucible. Whether theologians do their work, or not, whether ideologists turn the crucible into a carnage heap, or not; whether we choose to have Adam or Aristotle as our father — one thing we cannot change — the crucible is in the Potter's hands . . .

Our task is to understand the theology we must proclaim and the response we must make to the Potter's invitation to be our Judge — and our Saviour.

DIE KERK BUIITE SUID-AFRIKA

PROF. B. B. KEET

DR. HENDRIK KRAEMER, bekende skrywer van „The Christian Message in a Non-Christian World”, is reeds aan die einde van verlede jaar oorlede. Graag neem ons 'n skrywe van dr. J. van den Berg in Gereformeerde Weekblad oor, wat 'n waardering van sy persoon en werk gee.

„In die vroeë môre van 11 November is 'n groot man uit ons midde weggeneem — dr. Hendrik Kraemer, 'n man wat hom met elke vesel van sy bestaan aan die diens van sy Here gegee het. In die lewe van Kraemer het daar iets van die elementêre geweld van die eerste liefde geskuil”.

Kraemer is as weeskind in die Hervormde Diakonieweeshuis, Amsterdam, opgeneem en het daar, teen alle weerstand in, die Here gevind. Toe al het in die hart van die jong seun die verlange ontwaak om die Naam van die Here érens in die wêreld uit te dra. Uiteindelik was dit Midde-Java waar hy sy taak gevind het. Die pad wat daarheen gelei het, was een van harde studie, van innerlike ryping, maar ook steeds van ontplooiing na buite. As voorsitter van die Christen-Studentevereniging van Nederland het hy 'n somerkonferensie in die tyd van die Eerste Wêreldoorlog met die volgende woorde geopen:

„Daar golf 'n groot geestelike stryd deur gans Europa, ook deur Nederland. Ons deurleef die barenswêre van 'n nuwe tyd. Is dit nie om te sidder van blydskap, vrees en dankbaarheid tegelyk nie, wanneer ons sien dat ons in die N.C.S.V., mits ons ons taak goed begryp, een van die gewigtigste faktore in hierdie stryd kan wees? Dit is gewoonte in Christelike kringe om te sê dat ons ons tyd moet

ken. Ons moet verder gaan. Ons moet ons tyd belewe.”

Voorts praat hy van 'n „voortvretende relativisme” wat alle lewensbeskouinge „dood kompliseer”. Die N.C.S.V. kry die groot taak om die studentewêreld weer met die Christendom te „belaer”.

Hier, in die woorde van student Kraemer, ontmoet ons die latere Kraemer. Dit is die man wat die oog en die hart wyd oop hou vir wat om hom gebeur, maar in dié openheid bly hy met sy diepste bestaan gebind aan Jesus Christus, wie se openbaring vir hom 'n radikale, allesbeslissende betekenis gehad het.

Na 'n grondige opleiding in die Semitiese tale onder die beroemde Snonck Hurgronje in Leiden het hy via Kairo, waar hy 'n tydperk aan die Arabiese Universiteit studeer het, na Java gegaan. Hy het daar as sendeling 'n pos as skakelbeampte tussen sending en inheemse samelewing beklee.

In 1936, met verlof in Europa, kry hy opdrag om 'n boek te skrywe ter voorbereiding van die wêreldsendingkonferensie wat in 1938 in Tambaram gehou sou word. Begin 1938 verskyn dan ook „The Christian Message in a Non-Christian World”. „Sonder oordrywing kan ons sê dat hierdie boek, deur 'n man van die godsdienswetenskap geskrywe, een van die belangrikste produkte van die teologiese literatuur van hierdie eeu geword het”. Reeds die titel laat ons iets van die

dubbele gerigtheid van Kraemer se denke sien: die gerigtheid op die nie-Christelike wêreld, wat hy in sy religieuse en nie-religieuse bestanddele op magistrale wyse analiseer, en die betrokkenheid op die evangelie wat hy teken in sy radikaliteit en absolute enigheid, nie as lewens- en wêreldbeskouing nie, maar as verkondiging van die lewende Here in wie God Hom aan die mense gegee het tot in die allerlaaste offer, só dat die kerk in Hom verbonde is om tot die wortel te gaan in sy kritiek op en verset teen die kwaad van die wêreld, maar tewens in sy veenseelwiging met die lyding en dood van die wêreld.

Van hierdie boek het 'n sterk invloed uitgegaan, skryf dr. Van den Berg. Dit het soos 'n evangeliese tonikum in die bloed van die sending ingegaan om te versterk en te verlewendig.

Kraemer het nog twee belangrike poste beklee voordat hy hom in 1957 in Driebergen gevestig het as besige emeritus wat voortgaan om te skrywe en raad te gee. Van 1937 af was hy hoogleraar in die geskiedenis van die godsdiens en die Fenomenologie van die Godsdiens aan die Ryksuniversiteit van Leiden en na die Tweede Wêreldoorlog het hy direkteur van die Ekumeniese Instituut in Bossey by Genève geword.

Van den Berg sluit sy artikel soos volg: „Van hierdie lewe gaan na ons almal 'n roepstem uit om in hierdie boeiende tyd voort te gaan soos Kraemer gedoen het, en dit beteken om ons eie tyd intens en radikaal te belewe, maar tegelyk met so 'n oorgawe aan Christus en sy saak in die wêreld dat ons die koers volg wat Hy aanwys”. Dan

sal ons besef dat ons met die groot dialoog met die wêreldgodsdienste maar nouliks begin het. Dan sal ons ook begin verstaan wat dit beteken dat die Kerk van Christus 'n kerk in beweging is.

RUSLAND

Van anti-kerklike propaganda word daar in die laaste tyd nie veel gehoor nie. Maar aan die ander kant het die ateïstiese propaganda eer vermeerder as minder geword. As gevolg van hul wetenskaplike prestasies op die gebied van ruimte-vlug probeer die Russe nou op wetenskaplike basis hul propaganda te dryf en wy hulle aandag veral aan die onderwys op skool en universiteit. So altans sien die Metropoliet Nikodim dit in 'n onderhoud met 'n joernalis uit Finland. Hy sê dat die grootste moeilikhede van die Russies-ortodokse kerk op onderwysgebied lê. Die skoolonderrig is deurdring van ateïstiese propaganda en die kerk mag die Woord van God alleen binne die kerkmure of in die woonhuise verkondig. Elke vorm van godsdiensoonderrig is verbode en daarom is die prediking en die verbreiding van die inhoud deur die hoorders in hulle huise en vriendekring so belangrik.

Op 'n vraag na die aantal ortodokse Christene in Rusland kon hy nie 'n presiese antwoord gee nie, omdat die kerk geen eie statistieke mag publiseer nie (uit 'n bevolking van 218 miljoen word dit geskat op tussen 40 en 80 miljoen, maar die metropoliet het die vraag gestel wie as Christen beskou moet word — die gedoopte, die deelnemer aan kerklike feeste, of hy wat 'n Christelike begrafnis begeer. Hy het egter ontken dat die kerk oorwegend deur ouer mense besoek word.

Hoofbestanddeel van kerkbesoekers is ongeveer die vyftigjariges, die wat so oud as die rewolusie is, dus nie eenvoudig 'n oorblyfsel van die tyd vóór die rewolusie nie. Die geringe kerkbesoek van die jongeres word gewyt aan ateïstiese propaganda. Op sosiale gebied mag die kerk nie optree nie — dit is die terrein van die Staat. Verder word die kerk in sy werksaamhede geen stornis in die weg gelê nie. Sy grootste probleem is publikasie. Die kerk het laas in 1956 die Bybel in 'n Russiese vertaling kon uitgee (net 50.000 eksemplare) en op die oomblik word die kerklike publisiteit beperk tot een teologiese jaarboek en een kerklike maandblad.

THE CHURCH AND INDUSTRY

II

THE REV. JOHN ROGAN

A decision by the churches to develop an industrial mission springs both from an understanding of the Christian Faith and from social analysis. The first looks to the missionary practice and directions of our Lord. It studies both his apostolate and his service. He understood Himself to have been "sent" by His Father in order to achieve man's salvation; a task for which full power has been conferred.

During the course of His own ministry He commissioned His disciples to carry out a limited missionary task, and recommissioned them on an extended basis after His resurrection. The Church, therefore, becomes the instrument for continuing his work through the ages. It has its own apostolate and service to discharge. In English theology the Church is therefore sometimes spoken of as the extension of the incarnation. This is the only authority conferred on the church; an authority to do a piece of work, not a comment upon the calibre of its performance!

CHURCH AND SOCIETY

This apostolate and service can only be carried out if the Church can establish a viable relationship with the society in which it is set. If it cannot, or will not, then Christianity becomes the faith of an enclave of people, living apart from the society, in which they are set: a sort of latter-day Nazarite movement. Few can think that such a state of affairs is satisfactory; and it is true that it is rarely demanded, but a viable relationship may be frustrated because of the tension between mission and church.

Once a group or congregation has come into existence there is a tendency for it to become more occupied with its organization than its outreach. The problems are not seen, perhaps, as different; but they are looked at from a different angle. When there are fresh territories to open up, the need for mission is less disguised, even though it tends to become a separate part of the Church's life. Missionaries become those who have received a special call, and then a special training before 'going out' to preach the Gospel. Meanwhile, at home there are occasional worries about whether the missionaries will

become a fresh sect, remain true to the faith, and close to the mother church. Something of these tensions can be seen in Mr. Vincent Cronin's books about Jesuit missions in China and India: **The Wise Man from the West** and **A Pearl to India**. In some ways the difficulties of the French Priest workers are not dissimilar. There has been the worry about the spirituality of the priests, the temptations to which they were exposed in the French proletarian world, and a growing uneasiness that they were so anxious to identify themselves with French working class life, that they became more concerned with solidarity in it, than with making a critique of it. Nevertheless the Church is charged with Mission. There is no other body commissioned for the task. Wise forward planning, flexibility of operation and sensitive leadership are called for. The risks are to be taken: very little would ever be done, were only those courses taken which involved no risk. It is, therefore, good to see that the Roman Catholic Church in France has restarted the worker-priest movement. Priests are allowed once more to undertake full-time work, but not to accept appointments, such as trade union secretary, which belong more suitably to laymen.

CLERGY AND LAITY

From one point of view, industrial mission has been this kind of demarcation exercise, between clergy and laity. **Lay people are God's people dispersed throughout society. They are his executive agents in all the social structures in which they live, and in all the decision-making processes in which they share. It is in this way that the "rules" of God's kingdom are set forth and built up.** Not that the Kingdom is a particu-

(Continued on page 16)

The Church and Industry

(Continued from page 15)

lar reform or social programme, but, as Amos might have said, it is the plumbline by which obedience is measured. The laity need theological help in order to keep the plumbline in efficient use and to measure their work against it. This theological resource, for all practical purposes, comes from the clergy. They should be able to handle the resources of faith in such a way that lay people can understand it, appropriate it, and exercise it in their role as God's priesthood to the world. It is well-known, also, that the clergy tend to be used as the nerve-centre of the Church's communication system. Lay people cannot move about at all levels and all departments of a works. They are confined to their actual place of employment.

CONVERSATION

A better understanding of industrial life and the bearing of the Christian Faith upon it demands, however, some means of bringing people together to share experiences through conversations which are more than the technical discussions which take place in the course of the working day; and the trivial talk that occurs when there is some company social occasion. **One hesitates to use the word 'human' to describe the sort of conversation which the Church should encourage in industry; nevertheless even though vague it is the best available. It draws attention to the fact that Christianity is concerned to defend the humanity of men and that one way of doing this is to bring people together to look at questions from a number of points of view and align all of them to the Christian tradition.** For example, in the board room productivity might seem to be an attempt to increase the profitability of the company, amongst middle line managers an attempt to lower unit production costs, at junior supervision level an attempt to get greater departmental discipline, and amongst the production workers an attempt to get something for nothing. There is, however, a

better chance of having visions which are not mutually exclusive if people can be brought together on **neutral** ground to exchange views, and put themselves under the common judgment of the Christian faith. Moreover, the industrial structures in which these views have to be contained have a greater chance of meeting both human needs and Christian demands if they are operated as means to achieve certain agreed ends, rather than be considered as ends in themselves. The Sabbath was made for man, not man for the Sabbath! Common humanity does not only require philosophical examination but existential realisation.

It has been argued that managers and overseers in Great Britain could never have advertised for "factory Hands" had they really realized that they were asking for people like they themselves — barring cultural differences — to come and work for them. They needed people, but they asked for hands. A structure which serves men made in the image of God requires a humanity informed by the Christian Faith. In the estimation of many people the conference and study work of industrial missions has been one of the most helpful ways of bringing men to realize that they do share a common humanity which is expressed through such theological terms as the 'solidarity of Adam', 'being members one of another in the body of Christ'. In modern industry men, very often, do not meet others outside their own immediate sphere of work. They are nevertheless dependent upon them because specialization of labour prevents men from being sufficient to themselves. I have found from my own experience that such an industrial mission conducted by the Christian Church breaks down isolation, dispels prejudice, and gives some outward and visible form to the belief that we are members one of another through the work of Jesus Christ. What is the good of a truth if nobody can see it?

SERVANT CHURCH

This concept of the servant church lies behind industrial mission work, and incorporates the idea of the clergy being the servants of the servants of God: a title which is borne by the Pope, and which is a constant reminder to us that the

Church does not exist on behalf of itself.

It is the instrument of God for achieving his purpose, and leads not to the conclusion that Christians are specially favoured, but that they have been selected for a special job, so that the peoples of the earth might receive the divine salvation. The Old Testament is a constant reminder to those who think that after the Covenant has been made they may sit under their fig-tree enjoying the divine rest! No, the apostolic mandate has been given to us. **Work not rest is our lot: The continuation of the mission of our Lord, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit. And that implies the effective deployment of laity and clergy in significant areas of human life.** In the final article we must examine what is actually done in industrial mission.

(This article is the second in a series of three. The first appeared in our April issue. The third will appear in our next issue).

Die erns en die eenvoud van Gods daad in Christus suiwer die kerke van halfslagtigheid, veel-herediens en afgodery. Die bereidheid en die gehoorsaamheid van Jesus Christus veroordeel hulle selfbehoud en hul kompromisse met die wêreld. Die armoede en die lye van hul Heer spreek hulle aan oor hul wêreldse rykdom en hul „versigtighede van die vlees“. In Sy teenwoordigheid geld daar geen waardigheid behalwe Syne nie en onder Sy kruis kan niemand liggeraak wees nie. Wat dit is om te dien, leer Hy; wat dit is om lief te hê, toon Hy; en wat „goeie moed“ is, skenk Hy in sy belofte. Dat daar in sy oordeel genade is en dat daar in die onverbiddelelike reg van God op ons vergewing opgesluit is, openbaar Hy. Wanneer die kerke hulle Heer so ontmoet, suiwer Sy Gees die gemeenskap en leer hulle mekaar sien elk in die lig wat van hierdie Heer afstraal.

Prof. Dr. S. F. H. J. Borkelbach
van der Sprekel.