

PRO

VERITATE

INHOUD/CONTENTS

Die Afrikaner, die Bantoe en die Kommunisme	1
Christianity in Communist Countries	1
Inleidingsartikel/Editorial	5
Oordenking	6
Hiervan en Daarvan	7
Evangelia — Rewolusie — Verlossing	9
Readers' Views	10
Worker-Priests in the Corridors of Power	12
Kerk en Staat	14

CHRISTELIKE MAANDBLAD VIR SUIDELIKE AFRIKA—CHRISTIAN MONTHLY FOR SOUTHERN AFRICA

March 15 Maart 1965

5c

Intekengeld R1 Subscription

Jaargang III, Nr. 11

Volume III, No. 11

By die Hoofposkantoor as Nuusblad geregistreer.

Registered at the Post Office as a Newspaper.

Die Afrikaner, die Bantoe en die Kommunisme

— JACQUES KRIEL

Aan die begin van die Afrikaner se denke oor sy roeping en voortbestaan hier in Afrika, staan die gelofte van Sarel Cilliers. In die oomblik van hulle grootste onsekerheid bid die Voortrekkers onbeskaamd om 'n oorwinning in die oortuiging dat „...de ere Gods... erdoor verheerlijk (sal) worden dat Hem de roem en de ere van de overwinning worde gegee.”

Maar wat beteken dit wanneer 'n mens 'n verbond met God maak? Dit beteken dat die mens nou afsien van sy reg om volgens eie ideale en begeertes sy toekoms te beplan en sy daade te orden en hom volkome plaas onder die verordeninge van God. Die wese van so 'n verbond is dat hy onderneem om te leef soos God wil — want alleenlik dit is 'n lewe tot eer van God. Hierdie verordeninge wat nou die grondslag vir die verhouding van die mens tot sy God vorm is deur Jesus Christus saamgevat as: „Jy moet die Here jou God liefhê...“ en „Jy moet jou naaste liefhê soos jouself.“ Die verbond met God sluit dus die naaste in en impliseer 'n nuwe verhouding tot die naaste onafhanklik van ras, kleur of taal, 'n verhouding onafhanklik van die begeertes van die mens, 'n verhouding as opdrag van God. „Oral geld dus die onverbiddelike verordening van die nuwe verbond dat ons ons naaste, vriend of vyand, moet liefhê soos onself; dat ons in elke mens Jesus Christus moet sien, wie en wat die mens ookal mag wees;

en veral dat ons daarom elke mens moet behandel asof Jesus self ons toespreek deur sy teenwoordigheid.” (D. C. S. Oosthuizen).

Dit het ons voorvaders wel deeglik besef, en hierdie besef het gaandeweg sy uitdrukking ge-

vind in die begrip van **voogdyskap**: die blanke is hier geplaas om die nie-blanke volkere te lei tot 'n voller, mens-waardige bestaan. In hierdie begrip word blank en nie-blank nou aan mekaar verbind en op mekaar aangewys sonder om die een aan die ander op te offer. As ek Dr. D. F. Malan reg verstaan, het hy hierdie begrip so ernstig opgeneem dat hy, in die gees van Cilliers se gelofte, ons reg op voortbe-

(Vervolg op bladsy 3)

CHRISTIANITY IN COMMUNIST COUNTRIES

— PROF. G. C. OOSTHUIZEN

PART I

I have been asked to discuss Christianity behind the so-called Iron and Bamboo curtains. This is rather a difficult task but I think it is much better than merely giving an outline of what is taking place e.g. in East Germany. I hope to take a few countries, discuss the Church situation briefly and then to give a general outline of their theological understanding and the approach expected from Christianity in these circumstances.

EAST GERMANY

Germany as you know had been divided after the war into two sections namely the so-called German Federal Republic in the West, and the German Democratic Republic in the East, the latter

being ruled by the Russian-imposed Communist Government. German Protestantism had gone through severe tests during World War I and in post-war Germany it had to face National

(Continued on page 2)

Christianity in Communist Countries

(Continued from page 1)

Socialism — and after this again Communism. Before 1944 large proportions of the people in industries and mines had been drifting away from the Church.

Protestantism was severely tested under the Third Reich by National Socialism of which Hitler, the nominal Roman Catholic, was the great Führer, and by religious movements. Nationalism in Germany had been strengthened by men who had Protestant affiliations, namely, Fichte and Hegel. The so-called German Faith Movement had this same reaction to Christianity in its true interpretation. Added to all this was the work of Alfred Rosenberg (1893-1946) who emphasised the Germans as a master race as well as so-called folk religion. They rejected anything that came from Judaism. A number of university professors issued the so-called Eiscnach Declaration affirming their loyalty to the German faith and asking Hitler to give this faith official recognition.

The other main religious movement affiliated with National Socialism was the so-called German Christians. (**Deutscher Christen**) — **Die Glaubensbewegung Deutscher Christen**. They tried to give a religious foundation to National Socialism. They wanted a united Protestantism which would be the soul of the Third Reich. Their dream was to bring all the Churches into one National unity. Hitler became Chancellor on January 30th, 1933, and German Christians met in April, 1933, in Berlin in order to organize the Church into one single people's Church. Many pastors were attracted because they thought it would be a buffer against atheistic Communism. There were, however, different opinions on this. Müller was eventually elected Reichsbishop and had practically the same authority over the Church as Hitler had over the State. Eventually the Youth Movement of the Church was incorporated into the Nazi Hitler-Jugend. Niemöller became the leader of the so-called Confessing Church,

(**Bekennende Kirche**), which took form in January 3rd & 4th, 1934, at a meeting of a synod at Barmen in Westphalia. Barth made a notable address and was dismissed from the Church of Bonn. The so-called Barmen declaration was accepted on February 19th, in which the **Bekennende Kirche** clearly stated its position vis-à-vis Nazism.

Müller who was the leader of the established Church soon took measures against the Confessing Church. Niemöller was eventually thrown into prison and this brought the conflict between the Confessing Church and the National Socialists to a dramatic climax. In 1938, instead of a synod, the **Bekennende Kirche** convened a **Kirchentag** in Berlin. It reacted strongly to the persecution of Christians and Jews and deplored the persecutions and restrictions on the Christian education of the youth.

The War followed and the German Christians strongly supported the Government. The government continued its pre-war effort to eliminate from the theological faculties all open opposition to **National Socialism**. Many of those in the **Bekennende Kirche** worshipped in private houses, forests, in the veld, in barns, etc. There were those who gave their lives for their convictions. One reminds oneself here of D. Bonhoeffer. ("Letters and Papers from Prison.") Leadership came after the war from the opponents of the Nazi regime. In August, 1945, Bishop Niemöller organised **Die Evangelische Kirche in Deutschland**. (E.K.D.). **Hilfswerk**, a society established by the E.K.D. had as its aim to relieve widespread distress after the war, and to make contact with the many who were alienated from the Church. E.K.D. spoke out on public questions and the Church at one of its synods made its task in the world of labour one of its main themes.

Evangelical Academies were established — a creation of Eberhard Müller at Bad Boll in Würsenberg. In 1957 they numbered 18 — five of them in the German Democratic Republic. Farmers came to one conference, to another lawyers, to still another railroadworkers. The idea was to reach specific groups on

the fringe of the Church. They discussed the problems of evangelization of certain groups. They tried to get hold of the laity.

The **Kirchentag** movement which was started by a layman, Reinhold von Thadden-Triegloff, Chairman of the German S.C.A. and vice-chairman of W.S.C.F., also endeavoured to enlist the laity and deal with the problems of the revolutionary age. The first **Kirchentag** was held in 1949. This movement was an endeavour to counter the de-Christianizing phases of the revolutionary age. It sought to make Christ King of the new emerging society. The clergy also received attention at the faculties and the **Kirchlich Hoch Schülen**. The Young Men's Christian Association revived after the downfall of the Nazis.

The German Democratic Republic (Germany behind the Iron Curtain) had a predominantly Protestant population. Restrictions were immediately placed on the Church after the Russian occupation. It is impossible to discuss here all these restrictions put on the Protestant Church to bring it to its heel. I will refer only to a few.

In all totalitarian states the youth are affected first. They attempted to crush the youth movements. Religious instruction was made voluntary for pupils if the parents requested it. Teachers of religious instruction became fewer and in 1956 it was decided by the East Berlin authorities that religious instruction should not be permitted in schools beyond the elementary level. Only those pastors and catechists who were friendly to the "workers and peasant state" were permitted to teach the subject. They had to have special permits which were valid for only 3 months. These permits could be withdrawn by the headmasters at any time. These headmasters had control even over extra-school and extra-curriculum activities and this authority was applied to the preparation for confirmation.

The Communist regime attempted to substitute the confirmation for a formal dedication of youth (**Jugendweihe**). "Atheism" was the motto — weddings, funerals, naming of children were often

(Continued on page 4)

Afrikaner, Bantoe en Kommuniste

(Vervolg van bladsy 1)

staan afhanklik gemaak het van die volvoering van hierdie opdrag tot voorgedyskap.

Die derde groot begrip waarmee die Afrikaner sy verhouding tot die nie-blanke probeer bepaal het, is dié van „selfstandige ontwikkeling”. Hoewel baie politici hierdie begrip skynbaar onlangs eers ontdek het, en nou gebruik as 'n regverdiging vir baie dinge wat nóg met selfstandigheid, nóg met ontwikkeling iets te make het, skryf Prof. B. B. Keet reeds aan die einde van die jare dertig:

„(Ons) glo . . . dat die ontwikkeling van elke volksgroep volgens sy eie aard die beste wyse is om selfstandig te word. Aan daardie ontwikkeling moet geen perke gestel word nie . . . die gekleurde rasse moet tot selfstandigheid gebring word.”

As ons hierdie begrip ernstig opneem as „ontwikkeling tot selfstandigheid” en nie bloot as “selfstandigheid ter wille van geskiedenis” nie, dan is dit die noodwendige konsekwensie en eintlike sin van voorgedyskap, want die amp van voog is gerig op sy eie opheffing in die selfstandigwording van sy pleegkinders.

Maar in die afgelope tyd is 'n neiging in ons politieke denke te bespeur om ons reg op voortbestaan as 'n vrye volk te sien as 'n inherente reg op grond van ons historiese volk-wees en nie meer as 'n gedurige geskenk van God op grond van die volvoering van ons roeping nie. Die gerigheid op ander as die sin van ons voortbestaan word nou 'n gerigheid op onself, 'n bestaan-vir-onself. Ons nie-blanke naaste word nie meer gesien as 'n uitdaging tot die christelike lewe nie, maar as 'n gevaar en 'n bedreiging. Hierdie houding vind sy uitdrukking in die slagkrete van „swart gevaar”, „kafferboetie”, „apartheid”, „baasskap”, „segregeer of sterf” ens., maar vind ook gestalte in 'n duisend-en-een dinge in ons daaglikse lewe en wetgewing. Dit is 'n houding wat gewortel is in, en gevoed word deur, vrees en wantroue in ons naaste, 'n houding van die fundamen-

teelste ongeloof in die God van ons vadere.

'n Baie subtiele en daarom gevaarlike gevolg van hierdie houding is dat enigeen, ongeag sy motiewe, wat simpatiek is teenoor die Bantoe, wat hulle vriendskap en vertroue probeer wen en hulle wil help in hulle stryd om ekonomiese, maatskaplike, politieke, sedelike en opvoedkundige ontwikkeling as 'n heuler met „die vyand”, as 'n liberalis en 'n boetie van die kommuniste gebrandmerk word.

Maar is hierdie politieke houding trou aan ons verlede en relevant tot ons hede? Dat dit 'n breuk verteenwoordig met die „erwe van ons vadere” is reeds duidelik, want die gelofte van Cilliers en die implikasies daarvan behoort net soveel tot ons tradisionele erfgoed as ons taal en ander aspekte van ons kultuur.

Die implikasies vir ons hede is egter meer ontstellend. In 'n snel selfstandigwordende Afrika ('n selfstandigwording waaraan ons deur gelofte sowel as deur wetgewing nou gekoppel is), het hierdie houding en die daarmee gepaardgaande kommunistejag 'n vrees onder ons mense laat ontstaan om op enige manier as in 'n baas-kneg verhouding met 'n swartman om te gaan, en dit ten spyte van die feit dat die offisiële beleid die volle selfstandigwording (dus ook in intermenslike verhoudings!) van die swartman beoog.

Aan die ander kant het hierdie benadering die idee onder ons naturellebevolking laat posvat dat die enigste mense wat 'n oor vir hulle probleme en aspirasies het, die liberalis en die kommuniste is. So skep ons in ons bestryding van die kommuniste 'n beeld van die kommuniste as die „groot bevryder” en die „vriend van Afrika”. En deur ons gedurige bevestiging dat allerhande wetgewing wat eintlik niks anders beoog nie as die beskerming van blanke regte, vryheid, ekonomie, mag en gemak ten koste van die nie-blanke, nodig is vir die voortbestaan van die blanke, christelike, westerse beskawing, skep ons die beeld van die christendom as 'n net-vir-blankes godsdienst, as 'n godsdienst van die onderdrukker, en bewaarheid ons die klag van die kommuniste dat die godsdienst niks meer is nie as 'n opium om

die verdruktes van die wêreld te weerhou van die eis van hulle regte.

„In die Vaderskap van God is inbegrepe twee groot beginsels . . . Die een is die oneindige waarde van iedere mens, wat sy nasionaliteit, kleur, taal of maatskaplike en morele toestand ookal mag wees. En die ander is die broederskap van alle mense . . . Nie alleen individue, maar ook alle rasse en nasionaliteite staan gelyk voor die aangesig van God, en vorm deel van een en dieselfde broederkring.”

Dit is nie 'n kommuniste of liberalis wat hier aan die woord is nie, maar Dr. D. F. Malan. Maar sedert hy hierdie woorde gespreek het, het ons toegelaat dat die groot begrippe van menslike waardigheid, vryheid, broederskap en vele meer die alleenbesit van die kommunistiese wêreld word. Tensy ons hierdie begrippe weer in hulle fundamentele Bybelse sin herontdek en uitleef, het ons geen reg, laat staan nog die krag, om die kommunistiese opmars in Afrika te stuit nie.

ONS ENIGSTE REG OP VOORTBESTAAN

Want die kommuniste is 'n antwoord op die sosiaal-ekonomiese nood van die minderbevoorregte massas van die wêreld. Oorspronklik was dit gerig op die nood van die industriële arbeider in Europa, maar het in Afrika vandag homself aangepas aan die nood van die nie-blanke volkere. Ons moet hierdie nood en hierdie antwoord ernstig opneem, want daar is net een manier om die kommuniste effektief te bestry, en dit is om die nood waarop dit 'n antwoord is te bestry. En as ons geen beter antwoord op daardie nood het nie, dan het ons geen reg om die wapens teen die kommuniste op te neem nie. Ons moet bereid wees om meer vir Afrika en sy inwoners te doen as die kommuniste omdat ons hulle liever het as wat die kommuniste hulle lief het. Ons handelinge mag nie gedra word deur 'n vrees vir die kommuniste nie, maar omdat ons 'n goddelike opdrag het en omdat ons deur Jesus Christus verlos is van ons selfgerigheid moet

Afrikaner, Bantoe en Kommuniste

ons die nuwe Afrika onbevrees en sonder ideologiese bybedoelings vreugdevol toetree.

Daar is geen historiese, politieke of religieuse redes waarom die stryd om die fisiese, geestelike en politieke ontwikkeling van Swart Afrika nou juis die domein van die kommuniste of liberalis behoort te wees, soos sommige van ons politici by implikasie voorgee nie. Maar ten spyte van ons roem op ons voogdyskap, is dit 'n feit dat die meeste welsynswerk, opheffings- en noodlenigingswerk onder naturelle deur ons Engelsprekende medeburgers gedoen word. Onder al die fondse wat deur ons Afrikaanse dagblaai geloods word, het ek nog nie een ter wille van die nie-blanke teengekome nie! Ons wat 'n volkskongres kon hou oor die armblankeprobleem **moet** eenvoudig nou 'n weg vind om die uiterste teenstelling tussen die ekonomiese besit van wit en swart uit te wis. Dit is nie kommunisme of liberalisme nie, nog minder is dit 'n dwase idealisme — dit is die opdrag (deur God) en die onderneming (deur ons vaders) wat ons volk konstitueer het. **D't** is ons enigste reg op voortbestaan.

Maar die nood waarin swart Afrika verkeer is veel omvattender as die bloot ekonomiese, en dit is hierdie totale nood wat ons op ons moet neem en waarop ons met ons hele bestaan 'n antwoord moet soek. Die enigste aspek van hierdie nood wat die Afrikaner op hom geneem het, is die sendingnood, maar hoe belangrik dit ook mag wees, is dit nie genoeg nie. Ons moet ons jongmense as ingenieurs en onderwysers, as boere en besigheidsmense, as dokters en tegnisi die Bantoegebiede sowel as die groter Afrika instuur, nie om te heers of gedien te word nie, maar om te dien en op te hef, want 'n ware voog offer net soveel vir sy pleegkinders op as vir sy eie. Ons roem ons op ons voogdyskap, maar ons laat dit aan die Amerikaners oor om 'n vredeskorps vir Afrika te stig — of het hulle meer verantwoordelijkheid hier as ons?

GOD KAN NUWE MOONTLIKHEDE SKEP

Dat die politieke ontwikkeling van die Bantoe-gebiede 'n belangrike eksperiment is in 'n wêreld waarin politieke saambestaan 'n probleem geword het, en dat die regering reeds baie doen vir die nie-blanke op die gebied van opvoeding, behuising en hospitalisasie, is ongetwyfeld waar, maar tensy dit gepaard gaan met 'n verandering van hart onder **alle** blanke (Afrikaans- sowel as Engelssprekendes), sodat ons die nie-blanke as mens en landgenoot, as naaste en broer kan eer en respekteer, dan maak ons alles wat in hierdie sosiaal-ekonomiese opheffingswerk gedoen word tot niet en maak ons die leer van aparte ontwikkeling tot 'n bluf en 'n leuen. Wat tel is dat ons ons nie-blanke medeburger as mens sal ontmoet, want daarsonder is alles wat ons vir hom ook mag doen niks minder as 'n belediging nie.

Dit bring ons by seker Afrika se grootste nood, dié van kommunikasie tussen blank en nie-blank. Daar is onder blanke Suid-Afrikaners 'n byna neurotiese vrees te besneur om in gesprek te tree met die nie-blanke oor sy frustrasies en ideale, sy probleme en sy hoop vir die toekoms. Is ons bevrees dat ons die werklike omvanga van ons ongeregtigheid sal besef? Laat ons dan liever in ooreenstemming sterwe as om in ongeregtigheid te bly voortbestaan.

Maar hierdie uiterste denkmootlikhede is nie die noodwendige gevolg van so 'n gesprek nie, want God kan uit die openheid van so 'n gespreksituasie nuwe moontlikhede skep waaraan beide van die gespreksgenote nooit gedink het nie. Maar dan moet ons bereid wees om nie net te praat nie, maar ook om te luister, nie net te eis nie, maar ook om toe te gee, want alleenlik hy wat oop is vir oortuiging, kan oortuig.

Alleenlik dan sal ons optrede in Afrika gemotiveer wees deur meer as 'n politieke simpatiekerigheid of 'n beangste anti-kommunisme. Alleenlik dan kan ons volledig in ons roeping staan; alleenlik dan kan ons hoop dat God dit aan ons sal skenk om volwaardig volk te wees en hier te mag

voortbestaan, en alleenlik dan kan ons hoop om die kommuniste effektief te bestry.

Mnr. Kriel was voorheen lektor in Filosofie aan die Rhodes Universiteit, Grahamstad, en studeer tans verder met die oog op 'n Doktersgraad in Medisyne.

Christianity in Communist Countries

(Continued from page 2)

done in the atheistic spirit with the result that baptisms, confirmations, and Church weddings declined. Many pastors had to do secular work in order to supplement their salaries. It was difficult to build new or renovate old churches. Active Christians were discriminated against. Theological education experienced many obstacles. Many professed Christians who were workers were imprisoned, being accused of subversive activities.

The Protestant Church presented sturdy resistance to these attacks. The leader was Otto Dibelius, Bishop of Berlin. He was a leader during the Nazi years in the **Bekennende Kirche**. He was one of the main figures in the formation of the Evangelical Church in Germany. (E.K.D., **Evangelische Kirche in Deutschland**). The members of the E.K.D. had three possibilities: to conform; to openly oppose the State and become martyrs; or to recognise the authority of the Government, but to assist those who are oppressed and to help those Christians who are in official positions. The Church in East Germany decided on the latter course. They realised that only a total war could throw off the Russian power, and that guerilla and underground warfare would be futile. The Christians believed that they had to give testimony to their faith under **all** circumstances and to put their cause before the authorities and the public. They maintained that they could witness even in prison to the message of the Gospel and so be a help to fellow prisoners as well as to secret policemen, spies and in-

(Continued on page 6)

Inleidingsartikel:

DIE REGTE BENADERING

Byna 'n jaar het verloop vandat die Volkskongres oor Kommunisme gehou is — tyd genoeg om 'n objektiewe antwoord te soek op die vraag in watter mate daar enige blywende positiewe vrug tot stand gekom het in ons stryd teen die Kommunisme. Ons het destyds daarop gewys dat beide Kerk en gemeenskap in Suid-Afrika baie versigtig moet wees om nie in ons oorywer om die Kommunisme te veroordeel en te beveg, te verval in 'n emosionele vreesreaksie wat aan historiese grens nie en ons wil dit nou weer herhaal en beklemtoon. Oor die totale verwerping van Kommunisme as anti-Christelike en anti-godsdienstige ideologie val daar nie te rede neer nie — daarvoor is almal wat Skrif en Kerk bo alles bemin dit eens. Ons verskille ontstaan wanneer ons wil vasstel wat die oorsake van en die strydmetodes teen die Kommunisme is. En wanneer Christene uiteenlopende sienswyses oor laasgenoemde sake huldig en hulle meninge op 'n verantwoordelike wyse lug, moet daar nie die goedkoop kreet van „liberaliste“, „Kommunistiese saamlopers of frontgroepe“ aangehef en aangewend word om Christene wat dit eerlik meen, verdag te maak in die oë van die samelewing nie. Dat dit gebeur het en nog gebeur moet duidelik wees vir elkeen wat oë het om te sien en ore het om te hoor.

In die lig van die gebeure in ons land en in Afrika, veral in die afgelope jaar, is ons meer as ooit van mening dat die enigste gesonde benadering met die oog op die bestryding van die Kommunisme is om:

- (1) Volledige en verantwoordelike feitekennis deur erkende deskundiges op dié gebied te versamel en te versprei oor die wese, doelstellings en werkmodes van die Kommuniste.
- (2) Al die faktore — ekonomies, sosiaal, polities en geestelik — wat die Kommunisme se groei bevorder, onder die oë te sien.
- (3) Die taak en roeping van beide Kerk en Christen in dié verband te bepaal en dan dienooreenkomstig te handel.

Dat dit 'n geweldige taak is wil ons geredelik toegee. Dat dit 'n taak is waarby nie net die Kerk nie maar ook die owerheid en die gemeenskap 'n verantwoordelikheid het, spreek vanself. Juis daarom wil ons deur ons blad by wyse van 'n aantal artikels afkomstig van deskundiges sowel as besorgde belangstellendes (wat nie voorgee om noodwendig deskundiges te wees nie) die aandag van ons lesers op hierdie saak toespits sodat veral die Christene in ons land tot helderheid kan kom oor ons taak en optrede in dié verband.

Ons hoop van harte dat daar in kerklike kringe genoeg belangstelling openbaar sal word om te kan lei tot lewendige diskussie en doelgerigte aksie om te voorkom dat ons maatskaplike struktuur 'n vrugbare teelaarde bied vir die infiltrasie van hierdie goddelose leer. Maar bo al soek ons na die uitlewing van die waarheid dat daar waar die Evangelie met volle begrip en in diepe toewyding verkondig en uitgeleef word, die Kommunisme moet versterf.

Editorial:

Multi-Racial Religious Gatherings:
Clarity needed

The steps which the Government have taken with regard to multi-racial audiences at places of public entertainment have created a considerable measure of confusion, not only in the minds of theatrical and sports bodies, but also amongst Christians who meet regularly with fellow-Christians of other races in the execution of their religious or denominational duties. The responsible Minister of State has indicated that an official statement would be issued shortly to clarify the issue and eliminate any further misunderstanding. We welcome this announcement but it seems to us that this will only cover the secular bodies whereas legal opinion has already indicated that it could also affect the church — not so much in its worship as in its study programmes and conferences.

We cannot for one moment assume that the Government intended that these new regulations, in which permits would be required for many types of social and sport meetings or functions, should include or affect *bona fide* religious gatherings where the church, as in the past, gives expression to its obedience to its Lord and Master, to its duty of proclamation of and instruction in the Gospel to people of all nations. This Government, as all previous Governments of our country, has time and again re-affirmed its acceptance of the principle of religious liberty and its non-interference in those spheres of life, witness and service which legitimately belong to the church as the Body of Christ. We accept these assurances but it must be clear to everybody by this time that the latest measures announced with regard to multi-racial meetings have created not only confusion amongst new Christian groups, but also an unnecessary hesitancy to participate in church activities which have been going on normally for many years. Some church members have even come to the conclusion that it has now become illegal for Christians of different races (if such races include more than one colour) to meet in worship, conference, study, prayer and fellowship.

There is no doubt that this lack of clarity is harming the Christian fellowship and witness of all churches and Christian bodies in South Africa. And because we accept the assurance of the State Authorities, we feel it is essential that bodies like the Christian Council of South Africa and the Raad van Kerke van Gereformeerde Belydenis (N.G. Kerk) should approach the Government and issue a statement (jointly, if possible, but separately if not) to clarify the position and to serve as a reliable directive to all denominations and Christian organisations.

This is not just a matter of administration and organisation as far as the Church is concerned: it could, without ever having been intended to be such, become the beginning of a dangerous development which could eventually cut at the very roots of the life of the Church. And every denomination as well

(Continued on next page)

Oordenking:

So God Een Vader Is

(Johannes 17:11b)

Reeds buitekant die kerk
wys ons met trots die spil
waarom dit alles draai:
die puur menslike wil.

Die kruis het ons verban,
en dit sonder een traan:
die kruis is mos te Rooms
om op ons kerk te staan!

Nou koning-kraai die haan
en wys dat hierdie land
nie paapsgesind is nie,
maar uiters Protestant.

So God een Vader is,
is nie Sy kinders een?
Ken Hy 'n sinodale
en 'n paapse seën?

Voorspel die Bybel nie
wat vir Maria wag:
dat ons haar salig noem
geslagte tot geslag?

„Bely mekaar jul' skuld,
maar ons glo nie aan biege;
is dit dan Protestants
te sê die Bybel lieg?

Daar sal altyd iets bly
wat ons nooit sal verstaan;
maar buig? Aikona! Ons
bars van die eiewaam.

Laat dus die Here bid
vir eenheid in Sy kerk;
ons kies en sal verkies
ons eie handewerk.

So God een Vader is,
is nie Sy kinders een?
Ken Hy 'n sinodale
en 'n paapse seën?...

Hans van der Burgh.

(Continued from previous page)

as every Christian who puts loyalty to Christ above all other loyalties, must face this issue and understand the possible implications. We owe this to our Lord, to his Church and his people — in as well as outside South Africa.

Christianity in Communist Countries

(Continued from page 4)

formers and such like 'missions' of the state. These people they maintained, were all in need of the deeper values of life. They believed that God would use their efforts for His purposes and that He would give them strength even behind iron bars or in a Siberian prison camp.

The Church carried on with its work, refused to register its meetings with the police and they continued to carry out their programmes until prevented by the police. The Protestants in East Germany continued with this attitude in a limited degree and often at great cost. They were clearly **"a Church under the Cross"**. They carried on with their fine evangelical Academies and attended the **Kirchentag** in spite of obstacles that officials put in the way. They continued with Church services and Christian instruction although often with great difficulty. Dibelius continued to emphasise the position of the Church and pastors read these statements from their pulpits. Many of the youth outwardly professed that they accepted the Communist position but tried to keep the faith also, in order to secure advanced education and employment. Many maintain that the Protestant Church is more vital in the Eastern Zone than in the Western Zone.

RUSSIA

In July 1917 the Communists took over the Government. Production, distribution and transport were confiscated and made state institutions and the land was nationalized including that of the Churches and Monasteries. Early in 1918 the Church was formally separated from the State and all religious ceremonies and objects were eliminated from Government offices and functions: state financial support of the Churches stopped; religious teaching in the schools ceased and all property of the Church was confiscated; priests and other ministers were declared non-workers

and servants of the bourgeoisie and disenfranchised. Priests were killed in some places and one bishop also, although this happened as a result of local violence and not with the approval of the central government.

At first the Communist regime was denounced by the Russian Orthodox Church. (cf. J. S. Curtiss, "The Russian Church and the Soviet State, 1917-1950".) The civil war in Russia (1918-20) intensified the conflict as well as the famine from 1921-22 which swept the Ukraine. The Church itself was weakened as a result of division. The Living or Renovated or Renovationist Church arose which was led by clergy favouring co-operation with the Communist regime. The Communists supported this Church but attacked the Church as such which reached a peak in the 1930's when the anti-religious five year plan was adopted in 1932. In 1937 more than 1900 places of worship were closed i.e. 1,100 Orthodox Churches, 115 Synagogues, 110 mosques, 240 Roman Catholic Churches, 61 Lutheran Churches, etc. The German invasion, however, brought a partial truce. Gradually the Orthodox Church recovered. "The League of the Militant Godless" was now much less active and so was the anti-religious campaign. There was an inner vitality in the Church, it took a greater interest in political and social issues and at the same time there was a greater appreciation of the contribution the Church has made to the Russian culture, an appreciation due to the rising tide of nationalism.

The number of parishes increased in the period 1945 to 1949 from 16,000 to 22,000. In 1957 the Moscow Patriarchate told Christian Youth who visited the country that there were 20,000 Orthodox Churches, 35,000 priests, 8,000 monks, 8 seminaries and 2 academies for preparing priests. The Church, however, could only operate with the consent of the Government. In July, 1945, several Orthodox Churches met in Moscow where resolutions were adopted in accord with U.S.S.R. policies, e.g. condemnation of the Roman Papacy and refusal to co-operate

(Continued on page 13)

HIERVAN EN DAARVAN

"I hope you will not tolerate leadership in your churches by those who want to cut Christ down to suit the compromise and comfort of modern man, instead of holding modern man up to the everlasting challenge and cure of Christ on the Cross."

— Peter Howard, voor 'n gehoor in Ottawa, 20 Jan. 1964.

BY DIE DOOD VAN PETER HOWARD

Peter Howard is nie meer nie. Die vurige blik van sy donker oë sal deur ons nie weer gesien word nie, en die silwer klank van sy woorde sal nie weer gehoor word nie. Met verbasing en verslaenheid moes ons in die koerant lees dat hierdie onvermoeide en onverskrokke kampvegter vir die Goeie, die Ware en die Edele skielik, na 'n siekbed van slegs twee dae, in Lima, die hoofstad van Peru, oorlede is. Hy was daar as leier van 'n groot geselskap van die Morele Herbewapening wat die afgelope maande 'n groot kampanje deur verskillende state van Suid-Amerika geloods het. In die middel van hierdie groot werk — 'n werk van onberekenbare waarde in die kritieke tyd waarin daardie state hulle tans bevind — is hy eensklaps weggeneem, nouliks 56 jaar oud.

VERLIES VIR DIE VRYE WÊRELD

Sy vroeë dood sal 'n swaar verlies wees vir die wêreldwye beweging waarvan hy — saam met manne soos Bremer Hofmeyr van Suid-Afrika en Dr. Paul Campbell van Kanada — sedert die siekte en dood van Frank Buchman in 1961 die leiding moes dra. Maar meer as dit: dit is ook sonder enige twyfel 'n groot verlies vir die ganse Vrye Wêreld van ons tyd. Maar hoeveel mense sal weet wat hierdie man, Peter Howard, in belang van die Weste en van die Christendom gedoen het? Ons het onlangs gesien hoe al die vrye nasies van die wêreld hulde gebring het aan die nagedagtenis van Churchill. Dit was reg en goed dat dit gebeur het. Ons het gesien hoe die wêreld byna gek geword het by die dood van Pres. Kennedy, en hoe hy gehuldig is buite alle verhouding tot die werklike betekenis wat hy ooit kon gehad het. En nou is dit treffend, en baie insiggewend, dat die dood van

'n man soos Peter Howard slegs met 'n klein beriggie op een van die binne-bladsye aangekondig is. Wie hom ooit in lewende lywe gesien en gehoor het, en wie ooit een van sy toneelstukke gesien het, sal moet erken dat hier 'n man was wat deur woord, geskrif en lewende voorbeeld, 'n nuwe rigting en 'n nuwe inhoud aan tienduizende lewens gegee het, in Europa, in Noord- en Suid-Amerika, in Afrika en in Asië.

Sy energie was net so onuitputlik soos sy literêre talent; hy was op verskillende stadia van sy lewe die voorste rugbyspeler, die beste joernalis, en die suksesvolste dramaturg van Brittanje; die **twalf boeke** en **sestien toneelstukke** wat op sy naam staan, het sedert die oorlog byna 'n halfmiljoen dollar aan winste opgelewer, wat hy alles gegee het aan die saak waarvoor hy geveg het.

SPREKER EN TONEEL- SKRYWER

Vier jaar gelede het ek die voorreg geniet om veertien dae deur te bring in die groot konferensie-sentrum van hierdie beweging in Caux, Switserland: hoog teen die berg, met pragtige uitsig oor die Meer van Genève. Dag na dag het ek Howard daar hoor praat. 'n Lang, maer, atletiese figuur; donker, vurig, en hartstogtelik. Sy ganse persoon was die lewende beliggaming van daardie intense toewyding en diepe sedelike erns wat hy deur sy woorde by sy gehoor wou laat posvat. Hoe dikwels het ek toe gewens dat ek ons hele Sinode, ja ons hele Volksraad daar kon hê om na die besielde woorde van die man te luister! En elke aand was daar in die mooi skouburg 'n opvoering van die een of ander van sy toneelstukke: elkeen 'n pakkende drama van voor tot agter, en elkeen met 'n positiewe, christelike boodskap vir elke toeskouer. Onvergeetlik bly nog vir my die opvoerings van stukke soos **"Pickle Hill"**, **"The Real News"**, **"We Are Tomorrow"**, **"The Ladder"**, **"The Choice"**, en **"The Hurri-**

cane" — laasgenoemde sedertdien in Kenia verfilm en onlangs hier in S.A. vertoon.

Wat ek 'n besondere voorreg ag, is dat ek Howard self die hoofrol sien vertolk het in meer as een van hierdie stukke. Wie van ons kon toe gedink het dat hy binne vier jaar vir altyd van die toneel sou verdwyn?

TOESPRAKE UITGEGEE

Tot my vreugde bemerk ek dat daar onlangs by die uitgewers **Henry Regnery Company, Chicago**, 'n klein bundel van 12 toesprake van Peter Howard verskyn het: almal toesprake wat hy op verskillende plekke in die V.S.A. en Kanada gehou het tydens 'n reis deur daardie dele, nou presies een jaar gelede. Hierdie kort, pittige toesprakes laat ons Howard op sy beste sien: humoristies, wydbereis, wydbelese, vlymskerp in sy oordele, skitterend in sy epigramme, maar bowe-al, deurgaans besiel met 'n waaragtige christelike liefde tot die mens met wie hy praat en oor wie hy praat. As illustrasie van sy gedagtes, en as klein huldeblyk aan die nagedagtenis van hierdie buitengewone man, haal ek enkele paragrasies aan.

TIPIESE UITSPRAKE

- "If we could get the men of God actually to become the most passionate revolutionaries in the modern world and to live together as people ought to live who believe in God, I do not think there would be the slightest threat to liberty. If the men who still believe in God learned to make God the most revolutionary force in their lives and in the lives of their communities, the whole world would say: 'Of course, that's how we are meant to live.' That is part of our battle. It is a very hard part of our battle, because if you tackle the righteous, they get

(Vervolg op bladsy 11)

The Church must not make Political Decisions

— S. P. FREELAND

Secular politics has once again forced its way into the councils of the Christian Church, dictating a decision which many Christians will regard as being contrary to the mind of Christ.

The Council of Governors of the St. George's School, Cape Town, has ruled, by a narrow majority, that children be excluded from the school solely on account of their race.

No Christian or group of Christians can claim, of course, to have a monopoly of wisdom and guidance in the often difficult task of finding the will of God in a given situation. One readily concedes that there is always room for honest and sincere differences of opinion in regard to what is right and Christian in a particular context.

What is of deep concern to many of us, however, is not that there are such differences so much as the motives which sometimes lie behind them.

No one pretends that the issue with which the St. George's Council had to deal, arising from the application of a Coloured churchwarden for the admission of his son to the school, was an easy one. Test cases are never easy, and this was clearly a test case.

There will be those who honestly feel that the application should never have been submitted, that its purpose was merely to embarrass the Church of the Province of South Africa.

On the other hand many believe that it was made in all sincerity, because the churchwarden in question, like many others, was genuinely concerned at the compromising situation in which his church found itself over the fact that its schools were virtually "for whites only".

Whatever the motive, the application was made, and appears to have been given careful consideration.

Unfortunately it was apparently viewed by the majority of the Council, not as a straightforward application to be dealt with on its merits and according to the clear scriptural principles which the Church of the Province has so faithfully enun-

ciated down the years, but as a matter to be specially considered in the light of "trends of legislation".

In other words, the decision to exclude Coloured children was a political decision.

It is this increasing tendency to allow political considerations to influence the decisions of the Church concerning its own internal policy that many of us view with deep concern.

Although the school is governed by its own elected Council and not by the Diocesan Synod, this does not alter the fact that it is closely associated with the Anglican Church. For this reason its policy ought obviously to be in line with the teachings of its parent body, the Church of the Province of South Africa.

There is no question but that the governors did what most of them believed to be right and proper under the circumstances. Their integrity and sincerity in coming to the decision they did is not in question.

Nevertheless it is difficult to avoid the conclusion that they have, however sincerely, deviated from the clear command of Christ to render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's, and unto God the things that are God's.

In allowing politics to interfere with matters of religious concern they have rendered unto Caesar the things that are God's.

This is not the first indication of a growing "Vicar of Bray" attitude on the part of some members of the Christian Church in South Africa, who act on the assumption that Christianity must "adapt" its principles and its teaching to the prevailing doctrines.

This is a caricature of Christianity!

In recent years a number of churches in South Africa have elected moderators, bishops and presidents who have been non-Europeans by race. Their election in every case has been motivated by the simple desire to put in the best man for the job. Politics has had nothing to do with it, and no change of church policy has been involved.

Yet on all these occasions there has arisen a small body of people who have tried to drag in political considerations, and who have protested that such appointments have been "against the policy of the government!"

This is politics interfering in religion with a vengeance!

THE DIVINE IMPERATIVE

Suppose Christ had thus tempered His teaching and practice to the wishes of the rulers of His day. He would certainly not have been crucified, and in all probability He would have been forgotten within a short time.

Or imagine the apostles meekly giving in to the authorities when they were ordered to be silent, and saying, "We must obey men rather than God!"

How different would have been the history of Christianity if its disciples in every generation had been as fearful and accommodating as some modern Christians, and had been prepared to bow down to secular rulers who tried to tell them what was right in the sight of God.

Here is one of the greatest dangers to the Christian Church of today, that we allow secular authorities to be our guide in the conduct of religious affairs.

There is dire need in these days of the spirit of Luther and other faithful Christian leaders of the past. The time has come when we too must be prepared to say, "Here I stand; I can do no other; God help me!"

Once and for all we must resolve to keep politics out of the Christian Church, and determine to render unto God alone the things that are His.

Let the Church BE the Church! Let its pronouncements be, not "Thus saith the Government" or even "Thus saith the Opposition", but "Thus saith the Lord!"

Let it be guided in all its sacred duties, not by "trends of legislation" but by the clear commands of Christ.

Let it eschew the language and methods of politics, and faithfully fulfil its tasks as a body of people dedicated to finding and doing the will of God at all times and in all circumstances.

Unless it does these things, the Christian Church in South Africa, however popular it may become, is doomed.

Evangelie – Rewolusie – Verlossing

DR. MARTIN LUTHER KING PREDIK DIE GELOOF VAN DAAD
EN VOLEINDING

Ons lewe in 'n wêreld wat in hewige beweging is, in rewolusie. Maar ons moet daarby nie vergeet nie, dat hierdie beroering en omwenteling vir 'n groot en goeie deel die gevolg is van die feit dat die Evangelie oor die hele wêreld verkondig is. Die Christendom was die eerste om die idee van 'n brøederskap van alle mense te bring. Die Christendom het daarmee iets gebring waarop mense en volke hul hoop kon vestig. Die Christendom het ook die ontwikkeling van opvoeding en onderwys aan die gang gesit. En die Christelike prediking het by baie mense die oortuiging laat posvat dat die boosheid in die wêreld nie onoorwinbaar is nie en dat die Christelike Westerse volke die mensdom sal voortlei na 'n nuwe samelewing op aarde, wat in die teken van die Koninkryk van God sou staan. Die mense wat hierdie belofte in ons verkondiging gehoor het, het dit letterlik opgevat. En nou eis hulle dat dit waar gemaak word.

Dit was die Amerikaanse Baptiste-negerprediker Dr. Martin Luther King jr. wat onlangs in die slotbyeenkoms van die Konferensie van die Europese Baptiste-federasie te Amsterdam hierdie eenvoudige maar verrassende waarheid tot 'n uitgangspunt gemaak het van 'n pakkende betoog, wat geëindig het met 'n oproep tot die Christene van die hele wêreld om hul geloof en die verkondiging van die Evangelie waar te maak, sowel in hul persoonlike as in hul georganiseerde lewe, deur met God uit te gaan in die onbekende land om nie die las van die kruis te probeer ontwyk nie.

Hierdie kyk op die rewolusionêre ontwikkeling van ons tyd — gevolg en opdrag tegelyk van dieselfde Evangelie — is te verstaan uit die milieu van 'n Christelike negerbevolking wat in opstand kom teen 'n onchristelike en onmenslike diskriminasie soos dit tans in die Verenigde State in die kringe van dr. King die geval is. Vir die byna vyfduisend Europeane, wat in die R.A.I.-gebou onder die gehoor van dr. King was, bly dit egter ook 'n aktuele vraag in hoeverre welig die rewolusionêre beweginge wat Europa benou, ewe-eens ook voorberei is deur die Christelike prediking en juis van die Westerse Christene 'n juiste vervulling vra.

Baie Christene, sê dr. King, het ons aandeel in die ontstaan van die wêreld-rewolusie vergeet of verloën en hulle het dit vir die Kommuniste maklik gemaak om hierdie rewolusie heeltemal op hulle naam te bring.

Maar ons mag nie ons eertydse pogings om die wêreld na Christus

te bring nie opgee net alleen omdat die wêreld nie tot Christus kom soos ons dit ons voorgestel het nie... God werk in die kragte van die geskiedenis, in die sake van die mense. Christus het sy lewe gegee vir die verlossing van hierdie wêreld en in hierdie wêreld moet ons as sy volgelinge ons lewe gee om die versoeningswerk van Christus voort te sit.

VERSOEKING

Die kerk is nou voor die versoeking om te probeer om die wêreld terug te voer na 'n meer statiese toestand en om die gemeentes te vermaan om „die pad van die vadere nie te verlaat nie.”

Maar dit beteken niks minder as om dié God te vergeet wat met die woorde van Openbaring 21:3 belowe het om alle dinge nuut te maak, wat van plan is om alle dinge in die hemel en op die aarde in Hom te verenig, soos Ephese 1 vs. 10 sê.

Ons het feitlik geen keuse nie, so gaan dr. King voort. Want dit sou seker die dood van die kerk beteken as hy berus in 'n 18de eeuse bestaan terwyl die wêreld verder gaan. En sonder die profetiese getuïenis van die kerk sou die wêreld één groot bloedbad kon word. Ons sien alreeds hoedat kerk en wêreld altwee al hoe meer verbroekel nou dat die kerk etlike jare lank rakende die groot vraagstukke van hierdie tyd stil gebly het. Die belangstelling vir die kerk in die Verenigde State is slegs 'n laaste wanhopige uiting van die verlange dat moeder kerk ons sal vrywaar van die onsekerhede van ons tyd en van die komende eeu. Intussen word die lewe van die ge-

sin en die maatskappy al hoe meer ontwrig en die aard van ons nasionale bestaan wys homself in die gewildheid wat 'n kandidaat vir die presidentskap geniet as hy belowe om die land terug te bring na die wêreld van die verlede, sonder belastings, sonder hulp aan die buitenland, sonder sosiale voorsienings en sonder moeilikhede wat nie met atoomkrag opgelos kan word nie. En hierdie kandidaat vind sy aanhang juis by diegene wat die kerke in die state van die Midde-Weste en die Suide vul.

GROEPSGETUIENIS

Die enigste werklike uitkoms, so sê dr. Martin Luther King, jr. verder, is dat ons die wêreld van hierdie rewolusie met moed en skeppingskrag binnegaan en die stryd aanbind met die owerhede en magte van hierdie tyd, asof ons werklik glo dat Christus die wêreld oorwin het, nie net alleen ons klein persoonlike wêreld van uitredding van my eie siel nie, maar veral die wêreld van die rakette, die staalfabrieke en die honger en oorbevolkte lande.

Ten slotte het dr. King die feit beklemtoon dat die Negers in die Verenigde State in hul nood geleer het dat in ons tyd persoonlike getuïenisse van geloof, hoop en barmhartigheid nie genoegsaam is nie: Hulle moet georganiseer word tot 'n groepsgetuïenis om van invloed te kan wees op die gewete van ons wêreld. Dit geld nie alleen vir die rassevraagstuk nie — dis nie Negers wat alleen om geregtigheid vra nie.

Dis die hoogste tyd dat wat mens hier geleer het, toegepas word op die vraagstukke wat die kerk op elke gebied ontmoet. In die besonder is dit van toepassing op die miljoene wat in armoede gedompel is. Die Christene moet eis dat hul regerings só handel met die hulpbronne wat aan hulle toevertrou is, dat die bronne mag dien tot eer van God deur te sorg vir die kinders van God, waar ook al hulle in nood verkeer. Dit is die weg van die Evangelisasie in ons tyd, aldus dr. Martin Luther King.

Die bogenoemde verslag (uit die Nederlands vertaal) het oorspronklik as nuusberig verskyn in die „Algemeen Handelsblad” (Amsterdam) van Maandag 17 Augustus 1964 en word met erkenning aan die blad opgeneem.

Readers Views

IS THIS "SOUTH AFRICA'S SOLUTION"?

Dear Sir,

In "Find South Africa's Solution", (*Pro Veritate*, January, 1965), Mrs. Margaret Malherbe discusses the Myrdal and British Council reports on South Africa, and makes some suggestions for ways to resolve the present dilemma in this country. The Editor has invited discussion of this problem, and I should like to make the following comments.

THE CHOICE BETWEEN EVILS

Early in her article, Mrs. Malherbe rejects "prophylactic violence" "... because no good can come out of bad means." This is a curious distortion of the old adage, "The end does not justify the means." A great deal of good often does come out of bad means. The crucifixion of Christ is perhaps the clearest instance of this, for salvation itself resulted from the evil act of killing an innocent man. One cannot, of course, use this as an excuse for doing evil. But it should remind us that often one cannot avoid using "bad means". Frequently in social and political problems one is faced with the choice between evils, where whatever action one takes, he does wrong. If, when Hitler reoccupied the Rhineland in 1936, Britain and France had attacked Germany, this would have been a violent action which would have brought death to some — it would have been in one sense evil. Yet it would have broken the power of Hitler, and prevented World War II. In this case, considerable good would have come from such a violent action.

When is preventive action against an evil state justified? When Hitler entered the Rhineland, he broke treaty agreements and paved the way for future aggression. The great moral issue for South Africa is, at what point does a nation become a potential aggressor, so that the continuance of its policies threatens world peace? The British Council concludes that South Africa is now such a threat, and that therefore some sort of non-violent preventive action is necessary. In fact, the Council argues that to re-

frain from vigorous action against South Africa is a graver threat to peace than to engage in such resistance. It seems to me that this country's record of injustice and exploitation, within the context of African nationalism here and to the North, gives a good deal of support to the British Council's assessment.

With respect to economic sanctions, Mrs. Malherbe observes that "we need, not economic chaos, but a prosperous country urgently requiring the co-operation of all its peoples to make use of our resources." This is of course true. But is such co-operative prosperity possible under the present Government? The present prosperity, which has prevailed more or less since the last war, is based upon the patterns of migratory labour, low wages for non-whites, job reservation, and the exclusion of Africans from collective bargaining. While this prosperity has prevailed for white people, many millions of Africans live on an income below the minimum cost of living. (In Cape Town, approximately 80% of African families are in this category, and the situation there is better than in many of the other cities of the Republic.) Furthermore, during this period of white prosperity the oppression of non-whites has become worse, and race relations have deteriorated. Nor can we forget that the present white prosperity is keeping the Nationalist Party in power, for so long as it prevails, most white people are content. Surely the point is that prosperity for all will not come until the **structure** of the economy and of the whole society has been radically altered; and on the basis of the last twenty years' experience, there is little prospect of this happening automatically. Sanctions have been advocated as the only way, short of bloodshed, of effecting this change. As such, they must be carefully considered by responsible Christians, and not simply rejected with vague references to our needing "a prosperous country."

MORAL AMBIGUITY

In her conclusion, Mrs. Malherbe outlines a "Christian Response to Extremist Groups". I agree entirely

with the five principles drawn up by the American Quakers, which she lists. But as they stand, they are exceedingly vague. Most Government supporters would agree with them, with the possible exception of the first (dialogue between liberals and conservatives). These principles must be given **practical application** in terms of the immediate problems of South Africa. I suggest that the British Council report is precisely an attempt to apply some such principles to the South African situation.

Nor should we forget the moral ambiguity to which the application of these principles may lead. If one vigorously applies the fifth principle of the Quakers ("... committing themselves to an active share in the struggle among ideologies and faiths"), he is inevitably involved in controversy which may, at least for a time, make it more difficult to attain dialogue and reconciliation among opposing groups. Wholehearted commitment to the struggle against white supremacy is a Christian necessity — but it will mean inescapable conflict with white supremacists. In such a situation, one cannot always fully satisfy all moral principles at the same time. He must either accept this moral dilemma and live with it, or succumb to a paralysis which leads to no action whatever. The British theologians were, I am convinced, aware of the moral ambiguity of some of their suggestions. But they felt that to do nothing, or to be content with pious generalisations, was to encourage an even worse state of affairs.

NO RECONCILIATION WITHOUT REPENTANCE

Mrs. Malherbe pleads for reconciliation, and for "gradual and peaceful change." She does not, however, point out that there can be no reconciliation in South Africa until the whites repent of the sin of white supremacy, and work for a multi- or non-racial society. Furthermore, "gradual and peaceful change," while a noble ideal, has little practical value in the present context. The most obvious "gradual and peaceful change" which has taken place in the white community in recent years is the fact that increasingly large numbers of people have supported apartheid. There has been a steady increase in injustice. One is reminded of the intellec-

tuals in Germany during the Hitler regime, who discussed their hopes for a gradual improvement of the situation — while Hitler, with his concentration camps and his Wehrmacht, took active steps to move society in the opposite direction.

While this growth of oppression continues, and the evil in South Africa becomes increasingly intolerable, Mrs. Malherbe speaks of a "feeling" for the emergence of a "Third Force", a movement between the extremes of white and black nationalism. She remains, however, very vague about this movement. One would like to see more concrete evidence of the existence of such a "force".

Some South African liberals have for too long been starry-eyed about the influence of their small numbers, and predicted a shift in public opinion which simply has not occurred. I sincerely hope that such a "Third Force" is developing, though I see little evidence of it.

But no such hope can blind us to the hard facts of the present evil and of the extreme shortness of the time left to find a peaceful solution. I suggest that the Myrdal group and the British Council reveal a far greater sensitivity to these facts than do most white South Africans, and we should be grateful for their reports.

(Rev.) P. Allen Myrick,
Adams College,
Private Bag 308,
Alice, C.P.

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:

Dr. B. Engelbrecht,
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.

Eindredakteur:

Ds. C. F. B. Naudé.

Intekengeld:

Republiek van Suid-Afrika, S.W.A.,
die Rhodesië en Protektorate:
R1 per jaar vooruitbetaalbaar,
Oorsee: R1.50 per jaar vooruitbetaalbaar.

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.

VERKLARING DEUR REDAKTEUR INSAKE OMSENDBRIEF VAN DIE W.S.C.F. AAN SY LEDE-ORGANISASIES (JULIE 1964)

Dit is onder die aandag van die blad gebring dat bogenoemde verklaring wat as een van 'n reeks artikels en verklarings insake die C.S.V.-ontwikkelinge in ons land gepubliseer is, die titels noem van 'n publikasie of publikasies wat kragtens die Wet op Publikasies en Vermaaklikhede, No. 26 van 1963 as verbode lektuur deur die staat aangedui is. In die verband wil die Eindredakteur namens die Redaksie die volgende duidelik stel:

- (1) Die doel van hierdie uitgawe (15 Februarie 1965) was, soos in ons inleidingsartikel uiteengesit, om 'n aantal artikels aan te bied wat die saak van verskillende kante kan belig en sodoende 'n objektiewe weer-gawe te probeer gee van uiteenlopende standpunte sonder om ons noodwendig met sodanige standpunte te vereenselwig. Dit geld in alle geval vir die algemene strekking asook vir alle gedeeltes van die Omsendbrief van die W.S.C.F. waar optrede bepleit word wat geweldpleging inhoud, goedkeur of aanmoedig. Ons blad het sy oortuiging i.v.m. enige vorm van geweld as oplossing van ons probleme vantevore duidelik gestel en dit onvoorwaardelik veroordeel as in stryd met die leer en lewe van Christus — en ons doen dit tans weer.
- (2) Wat die onderhawige verklaring betref het die redaksie in goeie trou en onbewus van die feit dat ons 'n wetlike oortreding begaan, die stuk gepubliseer wat ons toegestuur is. G'n een van die publikasies waarna in die stuk verwys word, het die stuk vergesel of ons bereik nie met die gevolg dat dit ons nie opgeval het dat, sonder die verwydering van die naamtitel van die betrokke publikasie of publikasies, die publikasie van die stuk 'n oortreding van die wet is nie.

Ons wil hiermee ons innige spyt betuig dat dit plaasgevind het en wens aan te kondig dat alle stappe gedoen word om die saak in ooreenstemming met die eise van die wet reg te stel. Sover verbanne publika-

sies betref sal ons, soos in die verlede, bly toesien om aan die vereistes van die betrokke wet of wette te probeer voldoen.

HIERVAN EN DAARVAN

(Vervolg van bladsy 7)

far more angry than anyone else, and they start talking to you about theology and all kinds of things.”

- “Men who speak against Communism, but have hatred in their hearts against members of their own family, their fellow students, or members of the faculty, against people of another class, race or colour, are in fact spreading the Communism they denounce and deny. A free-for-all society, money-minded, sex-centred, success-driven, may strengthen but will never answer Stalinism or Hitlerism.”
- “The black man's chance is surely coming. What will he do with it? I do not say: 'Be patient.' I say: 'Be passionate for something far bigger than colour. Be passionate for an answer big enough to include everybody, powerful enough to change everybody, fundamental enough to satisfy the longings for bread, work and the hope of a new world that lie in the heart of the teeming millions of the earth.’”
- “All ancient virtues even the faith in Christianity which has been the strength of British home life, British integrity, British courage, are being assailed, questioned and undermined today. The assaults come from certain sections of the Press, certain television and broadcasting programs, even from the pulpits of certain beatnik bishops and perverted priests. Beaverbrook, through his Press, stands foursquare for faith in God, and honour in man, at a time when these things are not necessarily as popular as once they were. He stands frontally against godlessness and dirt. Millions in Britain honour him for it.”

So sou 'n mens kan voortgaan, maar genoeg. Die titel van die boekie is: **Design for Dedication**. Dit is interessante en besielende leesstof!

— ERASMIUS.

A COMPLAINT

Dear Sir,

First let me congratulate "Pro Veritate" on its outstanding February issue and the way in which the background and implications of the dissolution of the Students' Christian Association into four organisations was handled.

At the same time I have a complaint about some errors of fact concerning the history of the S.C.A. in the article entitled "The S.C.A. — A Glance Around" by Rev. Danie van Zyl. I do not for one moment believe that the writer has deliberately perpetrated a distortion. It seems rather that he has repeated in good faith what has been repeated to him and probably to the "Bantu Section" as a whole to justify the sectional division of the S.C.A. and to shift blame from the S.C.A. leadership and the dominant "Afrikaans Section" for this unpopular policy.

The article states that the division of the organisation into four racial sections was the result of representations in the early 1950s by the English medium work asking for such a division to "save them from being swamped by the Afrikaner majority in the S.C.A. and that by grouping themselves they would retain the initiative in furthering the work of Christ among English-speaking students . . . Thus it is ironical that the structure proposed by the English speaking students should have become the symbol of the apartheid spirit which showed itself so clearly in the numerous camps and conferences of the S.C.A."

As one who was closely associated with the S.C.A. at that time and actually present at the national conference which made the decision to divide into sections, I am absolutely dumbfounded that past history could have become so twisted as in the end to describe the exact opposite of what actually happened. (But this is not an altogether unknown phenomenon in our South African scene.)

I can state quite categorically that no such representations were made by English speaking leaders at that time (though it is just possible that something of the sort may have been said by someone at some earlier stage). If such representations were made then they must have been made in secret by unrepresentative individuals.

During the 1940s and early 1950s the English-speaking students, far from seeking sectional division, were eager to keep alive the existent contact with Afrikaans-speaking students and were taking the initiative in breaking through the colour barrier and establishing relations with African Christians. As a one time chairman of the Witwatersrand University branch I could describe in detail the efforts that were made (mostly without success) to include Afrikaans-speaking students, and the far more successful efforts to attract African students into our midst. A pioneer venture was an inter-racial study camp which proved one of the most epoch-making events in the branch life. During this period the English-medium work used to run study

tours of African and Indian urban life, and these were broadened to include not only English-speaking White students but also Afrikaans, African, Indian and Coloured students — with the knowledge and consent of the national council, though there were signs that this growing contact was becoming a problem for the top leadership. This came to a head when the Witwatersrand branch included two Africans among its representatives to a national conference at Stellenbosch. There were many expressions of appreciation from Afrikaans delegates concerning the presence of the Africans, but the General Secretary of the S.C.A. announced that the whole policy of the S.C.A. in relation to race would have to be reviewed. At the same time we were

(Continued on page 16)

Worker-Priests in the Corridors of Power

"We need worker-priests in the corridors of power as well as on the factory floor."

This sentence from Kenneth Johnstone* in "The Road of Peace" is profound, important and controversial. It is profound because it deals with the nature and the purpose of the Church. It is important because it is said with relation to the current big issues that surround us, and which Christians are too often loth to touch. It is controversial because there is very serious difference of opinion on how far the church can or ought to go in its entering into the field of politics.

Let us quote Mr. Johnstone further, especially the sentence which immediately precedes these words. He comments: "The Church cannot now dissociate itself entirely from the world of politics and history or retire into the gratifying role of outside observer and critic, the hair-robed prophet bursting into the secular council chamber with an occasional denunciation or an even rarer word of approval." There is no doubt at all that this is precisely the point at which there is a real divergence of opinion, and that this is, for example, seriously affecting judgment of the situation over South Africa.

This week the British Council of Churches has published in full the report of its Working Party, set up to study "The Future of South Africa." This Report the Council has commended to the Churches for their study.

In the Report the position is strongly taken that Christian obedience for the Church in the world involves more than resolutions on general principles. It involves comment on particular policies with the need for commendation of those which forward Christian aims and the necessity of condemnation of those which contradict Christian principles. This must involve the Church in commitment to specific policies and a wrestling with the practical implications of those policies.

And this position we have long argued.

This is understandable to most British Christians, though the position is not accepted by all of them or perhaps even by most of them. The urge to stick to general principles and resolutions on them is strong in the Church situation in this country and is one of the reasons for much extra-Church criticism of uncommitted Christianity.

In South Africa — if the representatives of the Dutch Reformed

Church at present in this country are as typical of that country's point of view as they seem to be — the position is rejected probably because it is hardly understood. The attitude of the DRC as stated by Prof. van der Merwe last week to Church-State relationships is far from that advanced here. The Church there may interview the State privately (Press notice of these occasions is regarded as unhelpful) on specific aspects of the policy of apartheid (in relation to migration problems, for example), but it does not feel it part of its obedience to question the morality of apartheid itself. Thus the DRC has never approved apartheid, and according to Prof. van der Merwe last week, never condemned it.

It is clear then that the dialogue between the British Churches and the Churches of South Africa is bound to be difficult to involve itself in political questions. Yet the fact that South Africans see this issue differently does not exempt the Churches here from facing up to it, an issue which this report throws down before the member Churches of the British Council of Churches as a direct challenge to them. Will the Church involve itself, as the Church in the world must do, in the "politics" of the nation, the day to day affairs of the life of the nation — houses, pensions, colour, war, or anything else that affects "the body politic"?

By taking a very clear line on this issue, the BCC has taken one of the most important steps it has ever done. It has visibly demonstrated on a major scale that Christians are irrevocably involved in all that affects men (with apartheid as much as Communism, to take their own example), that this means concern with every aspect of political life. And this, after all, is so obviously implicit in the doctrine of the Church. Christ's community in the world, dispersed as "salt", throughout the life of the world. As citizens, electors, officials. Church members face the issues with which, without choice, they have to do. And in that situation they must make their stand — as "worker priests in the corridors of power."

Let the whole Church follow the lead the BCC has set.

Editorial "The British Weekly"
February 18, 1965.

* K. R. Johnstone, C. M. G., C.B.,
Chairman of the International Department of the British Council of Churches.

Christianity in Communist Countries

(Continued from page 6)

with the Ecumenical Movement. In 1949 the **Komsomol** (Youth Communist League) as well as the schools attacked religion as being unscientific and tried to eliminate the ignorance of religion as well as its superstitions and prejudice. In 1950 the Society for the Dissemination of Political and Scientific knowledge attacked the unscientific approach of religion. Teachers were indoctrinated in primary and secondary schools into atheistic convictions. The periodical 'Science and Religion' aimed to throw religion in the waste paper basket of history.

In spite of the attacks the Russian Orthodox Church is very much alive today. More of the youth are in congregations than ever before. About 160 graduate each year from the seminaries and academies. The quality of the priesthood has improved. Preaching is prominent in the services, the sermon is an important means of religious instruction.

Apart from the 30 million in the Orthodox Church, which has joined the W.C.C. in Delhi (1961), there are over half-a-million Baptists, 50,000 Mennonites, and 25,000 Adventists. Even in a periodical such as **Voprosy Filosofii** (Questions on Philosophy) P. Cherkashin writes that socialism does not exclude all ideas of religion.

The Russian Orthodox Church has contributed much to our understanding of the Gospel through men like Berdyaev and Bulgakov. The west may now start to realize the liturgical depth and the inspiration of the music of the Orthodox Church. 47 years of intense persecution has failed. The Churches are full and visitors speak about the vitality of religion in Russia. As far as statistics are concerned attendance in proportion to the population is higher in Russia than in Sweden, Denmark, and parts of France, and even among the Protestants in England. It is higher in Moscow than in Copenhagen, Stockholm, Hamburg, Berlin and Paris.

Allow me to say something briefly about the Baltic countries, especially Czechoslovakia and Hungary before I get to China. In Czechoslovakia as in Poland, Protestants were a small minority but gradually increased in numbers. The Protestants suffered persecution under the Nazis. In Slovakia the Protestants were persecuted by the Roman Catholics who were in control. This happened also in Bohemia and Moravia. When the Communists took over the Czech Brethren church, which held the Augsburg and Helvetic Confessions, pledged their support to the Government as long as they had freedom to execute their principles. The Church received some freedom in the appointment of its clergy; the State guaranteed freedom of religion in public and private. Nevertheless, there were arrests of pastors for alleged "illegal activities", others were denied cards which entitled them to share in the distribution of clothing, and some small Churches denounced for their "western orientation."

The Protestants accepted, or rather acquiesced, in the Communist regime. Josef Hromadka, who studied in Austria, Switzerland, Germany and Scotland and taught at Princeton Theological Seminary from 1939 to 1947 became the leading theologian as well as one of the central figures in Ecumenical circles. He saw in Communism a verification of much that has been neglected by the Western so-called Christian nations, e.g. peace and taking care of the underprivileged. But more about this later.

HUNGARY

A larger proportion of the nation were Protestants than in other Baltic countries but under the Communist regime the Church has declined very quickly. Restrictions were placed on religious instruction in the schools; clergy were forced to take an oath of loyalty to the Government.

Protestantism has declined in general in the Baltic countries due to secularization, two world wars and the fact that most of this region came under the Communist regime.

(To be continued)

KERK EN STAAT

— B. B. KEET

Die verhouding van kerk en staat staan teenswoordig in die brandpunt van belangstelling dwars deur die Christelike wêreld. Ook met betrekking tot die buite-Christelike godsdiens is dit van die grootste belang om te weet hoe die Christen hom moet gedra waar hy in aanraking kom met magte wat hom vyandig gesind is en sy godsdiens aan beperkinge of selfs algehele verbod onderwerp word. Daarom is dit te verwelkom as skrywers ook in Suid-Afrika ernstige pogings aanwend om oor hierdie onderwerp helderheid te bereik. 'n Sodanige poging wat ons aandag verdien, word deur een van ons jong teoloë gedoen in 'n geskrif wat as proefskrif gedien het ter verkryging van die graad van Doktor in die Godsgeleerdheid aan die Universiteit van Utrecht (Nederland) — „Kerk en Staat” deur J. H. P. van Rooyen. Aan die hand van dié proefskrif wil ons probeer om die belangrikheid van die verhouding van kerk en staat te bespreek in die vertroue dat dit ons 'n stap nader kan bring in ons begrip van 'n probleem waarvoor nog steeds die grootste onsekerheid bestaan.

KUYPER EN VAN RULER: VERGELYKING

Die skrywer benader sy onderwerp in 'n bepaalde gesigskring waar hy onder verskillende hoofde 'n vergelyking trek tussen die opvattinge van Abraham Kuyper en Prof. van Ruler, sy promotor in Utrecht. (Die onderwerp van die dissertasie heet dan ook: 'n Vergelyking Tussen Kuyper en van Ruler) en toon die ooreenkomste sowel as die verskille aan wat in die beskouing van hierdie twee manne gevind word. Op die ooreenkomste sal ons terloops kan wys, maar van meer belang is die verskil van uitgangspunt wat die opvattinge van genoemde twee manne kenmerk en waaruit hulle uiteenlopende interpretasies afgelei kan word. Om dit onder een noemer saam te vat, kan gesê word dat dié verskille ontstaan uit hulle opvatting van die aard en betekenis van die besondere (partikuliere) en die algemene genade en van die verhouding waarin dié twee tot mekaar staan. Onder verskillende hoofde word die vergelyking getref en aan-

getoon hoe Kuyper sowel as van Ruler, in hul toepassing van die beginsel, noodsaaklik tot verskillende gevolgtrekkings moes kom.

Soos bekend is, het Kuyper sy siening gegrond op die stelling dat die kerk uit die besondere genade opkom, terwyl die staat sy bestaan alleen aan die algemene genade te danke het. Sonder die besondere genade in Christus Jesus sou daar geen kerk wees nie, en sonder die algemene genade (wat aan alle mense geskenk word) sou daar geen georderde samelewing wees nie.

Die verhouding tussen dié twee kan aangedui word deur die beeld van die kerk as 'n gebou met vensters wat sy lig oor die omgewing laat deurstraal, terwyl die staat selfstandig gebruik maak van die lig wat so op sy terrein versprei word. Nie direk nie, maar indirek is die kerk geroepe om aan die staat leiding uit die Woord te gee sodat hy op sy eie terrein sy taak kan vervul. Direk het die kerk geen roeping teenoor die staat nie (d.w.s. die kerk in sy sigbare institutêre vorm). Hier kan die kerk alleen in organiese sin optree bv. deurdat gelowiges hulle tot 'n politieke party organiseer en op staatkundige terrein die stryd teen die sondige magte van hierdie wêreld aanknoop. Anders gestel: die owerheid vervul sy taak deur die genade van God (algemeen) en nie deur die genade van Christus nie (partikulier). Die kerk as instelling van die besondere genade, het Christus as Hoof en Koning; die staat is nie 'n staat onder Christus as Koning nie, maar hoogstens 'n staat waar die begrippe van reg en geregtigheid so deur die besondere genade verlig word dat dit 'n Christelike kleur aanneem. So besien, sou dit moontlik wees om aan elkeen (kerk en staat) sy eie terrein toe te ken en alle botsing te vermy.

VAN RULER: DIE KONINKRYK-GEDAGTE

Van Ruler aan die ander kant beklemtoon die gedagte van die Koninkryk van God, waar die hede alleen verstaan kan word as werk van God met die oog op die uiteinde (eskatologies). Die sentrale boodskap van die Bybel, beide in die Ou en Nuwe Testament, is dié van die

Hierdie is die eerste van 'n paar artikels uit die pen van Prof. B. B. Keet van Stellenbosch oor 'n baie aktuele onderwerp. „Pro Veritate” kondig verder met genoeë aan dat Prof. Keet ingestem het om eersdaags 'n gereelde rubriek — „Die Kerk In Die Buiteland” te behartig.

Koninkryk van God. Daarom moet die dade van God verstaan word as dade wat sy koninkryk, deur onderhouding van sy heilige wet, bevorder. Die Ou Testament beoog die heiliging van die nasionale lewe en in die Nuwe Testament het Christus die wet vervul, nie afgeskaf nie. Hy is Saligmaker van die hele mens en die hele wêreld en dit is in hierdie wêreld dat die Koninkryk van God gerealiseer moet word. Dit vind plaas in die werk van die Heilige Gees wat van Christus uitgaan en die geskiedenis tot stand bring. Hy is die sentrum van die nuwe geskiedenis met twee instelling — nl. die kerk en die staat. Nie slegs die kerk is deur God daargestel om die lewe van die nasie te lei, maar ook die staat is daar om op sy eie wyse dieselfde doel te dien. Taak van die kerk is om die staat gedurig te herinner aan sy roeping sodat dit 'n Christelike staat kan wees wat in ooreenstemming met die eise van Gods Woord die nasie regeer.

Volgens van Ruler is dit dan die teokratiese gedagte dat die kerk gedurig die staat profeties moet aanspreek sodat die nasionale lewe as diens van God volbring word. Christus moet heers oor die hele lewe en die hele wêreld: ook in die staatslewe moet Hy heers. Daarom is die roeping van die staat nie slegs om 'n plek vir die kerk in die samelewing te waarborg nie (as een onder ander kringe van die gemeenskap) maar hy moet self sy bydrae lewer tot die Christelike roeping van die nasie.

Verskeie vrae ontstaan uit hierdie basiese verskil, soos bv. die volkskerk, eenheid en pluriformiteit van die kerk, die neutrale staat en dergelyke meer. In die loop van ons bespreking sal daarna verwys word. Dit is egter goed om daarop te let dat die essensiële verskil ontstaan uit die verhouding van algemene en besondere openbaring. Die vraag is:

- (1) wat is hulle verhouding tot mekaar — en

- (2) hoe werk die besondere openbaring (kerk) in op die algemene.

DIE VOLKSKERK-IDEË

Uit hierdie tweërlei beginsel — Kuyper se verhouding van algemene en besondere openbaring, van Ruler se Koningskap van Christus op elke gebied van die lewe — vloei verskillende toepassings voort. Ten eerste die idee van die volkskerk. Hier blyk dit dat daar 'n mate van misverstand heers. Kuyper se volgelinge verwyrt dit aan van Ruler dat hy 'n volkskerk voorstaan wat die hele volk insluit, gelowiges sowel as ongelowiges en verwerp tereg dié gedagte volkome. Die wese van die kerk bestaan immers alleen uit die gelowiges met hulle kinders, en kan daarom nie die hele volk insluit nie. **Van Ruler antwoord dat hy nie in daardie sin van 'n volkskerk spreek nie, maar alleen daarop aandring dat die kerk 'n roeping het vir die hele volkslewe omdat Christus op alle terreine van die lewe as Koning heers — nie slegs Koning van sy kerk is nie, maar oor die ganse werklikheid heers en deur sy kerk die hele volkslewe aanspreek.** In sy profetiese roeping het die kerk die reg en die plig om sy getuie by die staat te laat geld, sonder dat hy hom met die tegniese van die staatkunde inlaat. Die staat bemoei hom, trouens, nie slegs met die tegniese nie, maar kragtens sy geestelike agtergrond, ook met die geestelike en sedelike, en hieroor het die kerk wel 'n woord te spreek. Dit is ondenkbaar dat die kerk hom alleen moet bekommer oor die persoonlike, subjektiewe lewe, terwyl die vernamste deel van die menslike lewe wat deur die sosiale verhoudings bepaal word, geen belang vir hom het nie. Hierby moet egter duidelik verstaan word dat die kerk van geen middel gebruik mag maak nie as net die oorredingskrag van die evangelie. Alle middels van geweld (wat baie vorms kan aanneem en nie altyd openlike dwang beteken nie) lê buite die terrein van kerklike roeping.

CHRISTELIK-POLITIEKE PARTYE

Volgens die beginsel van soewereiniteit in eie kring is dit dan vir die kerk ongeoorloof om op die terrein van die staat in te tree. Daarom sê Kuyper moet daar 'n ander weg gevind word waardeur die Christe-

like gedagte op die staatkunde inwerk. Nie die kerk as instituut nie, maar die kerk as organisme moet hier optree deur die stigting van Christelik-politieke groepe wat direk op politieke gebied alle anti-Christelike magte kan bestry en 'n staatkunde kan beoefen wat deur die Christelike beginsel beheers word. Van Ruler gee toe dat onder hedendaagse omstandighede die stigting van Christelik-politieke partye noodsaaklik geword het, maar het sy bedenkinge teen die bestendiging daarvan.

Die vraag is egter of so 'n groepsvorming moontlik of wenslik is, moontlik omdat so 'n skerpe skeidslyn tussen Christelike en nie-Christelike politiek nie getrek kan word nie en wenslik omdat die praktyk bewys het dat dit skadelik werk op die invloed wat van die evangelie uitgaan. Daar kan botsing kom tussen die getrouheid wat aan die kerk en aan die party verskuldig is. Bovendien is dit twyfelagtig of 'n belynde Christelik-politieke program voorgehou of gepropageer kan word, daar kan slegs by benadering sprake wees van wetgewing wat 'n Christelike agtergrond het en daarom alle anti-Christelike gedagtes vermy en bestry. In sover het Kuyper gelyk, dat die evangelie verligting bring aan hulle wat op die gebied van die algemene openbaring die staatkunde beoefen; dit neem egter nie weg nie dat daar nog groot verskil van opvatting ook onder hulle kan bestaan.

Die vraag is nou of dit die aangewese weg is waarop die kerk sy getuie ten opsigte van die staat (wetgewing, regering, regspraak, ens.) kan laat hoor. Word daar nie ook onder Christene partye gevorm wat teenoor mekaar staan nie? Hulle verskil is die wyse waarop hulle die staatkundige taak verstaan. In die geestelike lewe kan 'n mens ver gevorderd wees sonder dat jy dit ver gebring het in jou begrip van die staatkunde — die Christen is nie altyd die beste politikus of staatsman nie! 'n Christelike politieke program is onder alle omstandighede 'n onsekere ding, en die verdeling sou 'n mens-gemaakte wees met verdenking teen almal wat daarvan verskil.

DIE ROEPING VAN KERK TEENOOR STAAT

Wat is dan die roeping van die kerk teenoor die staat? O.i. strek dit nie verder nie as 'n getuie wat

waak vir die geestelike en sedelike behoud van die volk. Daarin moet hy getrou en onverskrokke wees nie deur die geroep van 'politiek in die kerk' afgeskrik word nie. Hy is bewaarder en verkondiger van die profetiese woord en verantwoordelik vir die wyse en omstandighede waarin dit gebruik word. As die kerk nie getuig nie, wie sal dit dan doen? 'n Aanverwante vraag is dié van die Christen se houding teenoor bestaande politieke partye. Moet hy hom aansluit by die party van sy keuse of moet hy hom aan alle partye onttrek en sy eie weg bewandel? Die antwoord hierop skyn te wees dat hy gebruik moet maak van die bestaande organisasies — hy sal tog op 'n ander weg nie veel kan uitrig nie — maar hy sal altyd sy reg van kritiek en reformasie moet laat geld om die grondslag en die praktyk van sy party almeer in ooreenstemming met die Christelike gedagte te bring. Ook daarin sal hy met reg aanspraak kan maak op die voorligting van die kerk. Maar (sal die teenwerping kom) watter kerk word hier bedoel? Feit is tog dat die kerk alleen 'n veelvormigheid van openbaring vertoon en daarom nie met een stem kan spreek nie. Hierteenoor moet daarop gewys word dat by alle verskeidenheid die eenheid van die Christelike kerk nie uit die oog verloor mag word nie. Op staatkundige gebied sal die mate van ooreenstemming groter kan wees as op kerklike gebied waar die belydenisgrond skerper belynd en van meer presiese aard is. Sulke vraagstukke as dié van Sondags-, arbeids- en openbare sedelike swette vind onder die kerke 'n groot mate van ooreenstemming by alle verskil in besonderhede. Kuyper het in sy politieke loopbaan self kans gesien om met die Rooms-Katolieke saam te werk.

So bly daar nog talle van vrae oor wat slegs by benadering kan opgelos word. **Belangrik is dat die Christelike beginsels wat op staatkundige terrein van betekenis is, suiwer bely en konsekwent toegepas word. Nie slegs bely nie, maar ook uitgeleef word, al sou dit beteken dat die Christen homself daaronder moet verloën. Dit is trouens sy enigste wapen as volgeling van Hom wat sy lewe vir die wêreld gegee het. Juis omdat die staat van geweld gebruik maak, is dit vir die kerk ondoenlik om sy belange deur wetgewing of staatsbesluit te bevorder.**

(Vervolg op bladsy 16)

(*Vervolg van vorige bladsy*)

'n Teokratiese staat, soos deur van Ruler voorgestaan, sou òf 'n staatskerk òf 'n publieke kerk bo ander bevoorreg, en die geskiedenis het duidelik aangetoon dat sodanige bevoorregting nie tot heil van die kerk strek nie. Of dit nou 'n demokra-

BISKOP NEWBIGIN OOR SENDING EN KERK

Biskop Leslie Newbegin, het volgens *Life and Work* van Mei, die volgende onlangs in Edinburg gesê:

„Die Wêreldtoestand is nog steeds aan die verander. ONS kan nie langer aan die sending slegs as 'n beweging van Europese en Amerikaanse kerke na Asië en Afrika dink nie. Vandag is dit 'n sending na al die verstelende: èen sending wat deur al die kerke om die aardbol onderneem word. Hier, in ons eie Skotland, word sendingwerk gedoen. Daar is veel vir ons in hierdie verband van Asië en Afrika te leer. Daarom sal ons predikante en lidmate uit dié dele verwelkom as hulle ons met hul ondervinding en wysheid kom bystaan. Daar word sendingwerk in Asië en Afrika en elders gedoen en dit moet in 'n gees van blymoedige samewerking verrig word. Evangelisasie, uitgaande van een kerkgenootskap na sendingvelde wat na daardie genootskap genoem word, is iets van die verlede.

„**Ons moenie kerk en sending van mekaar skei nie. Die kerk is self die sending of ons nou van sending in ons eie land of in Afrika dink. En tog moet ons daarteen waak om die woord sending af te stomp en te algemeen in sy betekenis te maak. Dit verg steeds nog van ons om „die hele wêreld in te gaan” mits ons nie vergeet om by ons eie deur te begin nie.**”

Dr. Newbegin het gevra of sy kerk ernstig genoeg daarna streef om gemeentes volgens hierdie nuwe patroon te vorm wat in hierdie „totale” sin sendingbewus is. Elke gemeente moet 'n sendingondernemende gemeente wees.

„Dalk sal dit 'n nuwe organisasie vereis. Is ons bereid om te begin vra en soek na die mees effektiewe organisasie met die oog op die nood en die eise van die tyd, of is ons te geheg aan ons ou vorms en gebruike?” Dr. Newbegin het aangedring op openheid vir Christus se leiding ook wat betref nouer samewerking met ander.

tiese republiek of 'n verligte, welwillende despotisme is, kan in hierdie geval die sug wel geslaak word dat die Here die kerk van sy vriende mag bewaar!

VERDRAAGSAAMHEID NODIG

Om te besluit: daar sal onder Christen-denkers groot verdraagsaamheid betrag moet word en nie opgetree word asof die laaste woord gespreek is nie. Afkeurenswaardig veral is die gewoonte om alle afwykinge van ons verklaarde apartheidsbeleid tot mislukking te veroordel: òf dit òf chaos! Op Christelike standpunt word gedwonge apartheid sonder enige twyfel ver-

A COMPLAINT

(*Continued from page 12*)

aware that the S.C.A. was under considerable pressure from the Dutch Reformed Church side, and that the withdrawal of financial and other support from such quarters was a real threat.

SECTIONALISM PREVAILED

A few years later came the proposal for the sectional division of the S.C.A., originating, to all intents and purposes, from the top leadership in Stellenbosch. The result was a foregone conclusion because of the predominance of the Afrikaans-speaking students in the organisation, yet the small English-speaking group took up the cudgels with valour. At the subsequent national conference at Winklespruit in Natal practically every English-speaking representative rose to speak against the proposal. There were not many African and Coloured representatives, as this side of the work was subsidiary to the rest, and when an objection was raised against the legality of the conference because of the absence of branch representation for these groups it was ruled by legal counsel that the old constitution did not make this provision. Having lost the vote on the general principle of division we still did not give up, but tried to persuade the conference to accept moderating clauses. We found that there were Afrikaans-speaking delegates who were not happy about the new development, although they had not voted with us. Together we worked out a clause

oordeel tensy dit met verskeidenheid (differentiasie) verwar word.

Selvs as tydelike maatreël kan dit nie geregverdig word nie, want 'n goeie doel word nie deur slegte middels bereik nie. Die alternatief van apartheid is nie integrasie op elke gebied nie; daar sal weë gevind moet word om die gevare van integrasie te vermy, terwyl die onreg van gedwonge apartheid reggemaak word. Gevaarlikste van alle gedagtes is die veronderstelling dat die enigste oplossing is om tussen blank en nie-blank 'n kragmeting te laat plaasvind, want dit sou beteken dat die Christelike strydperk verlaat en die duiwel deur Beëlsebel bestry word.

making it possible for branches to affiliate to more than one section and so to have a mixed membership if they wished and to maintain contact with as many sections as they saw fit. This was actually adopted by the conference, but we did not notice that in the final rapid reading of the new constitution this clause was left out! We only became aware of the omission when the constitution was circulated some time later, and when objections were made to the S.C.A. headquarters the action was justified by the argument that the clause contradicted the sectional principle which had been adopted in the first instance.

So it was that sectionalism prevailed, not without a struggle, and not without strenuous efforts thereafter to keep alive what contact was possible. All honour to those (especially English-speaking travelling secretaries through the years) who have never given up but who have gone miles — literally hundreds of miles — out of their way to preserve the tenuous links. There are still those (like the S.C.A.) who have not abandoned the cause of Christian unity in the student sphere as in the wider South African setting. The entire country is entering a new phase in which a concerted effort is being made to smother all contacts between the races on a basis of equality, a period of acute crisis in particular for the Church in South Africa as it faces strong government pressure to conform to a pattern that contradicts the nature of the Church.

Winsome Munro,
P.O. Box 1122,
Johannesburg.