



PRO VERITATE

CALVIN COOK

Some frustrations and hopes of this five year old

JAMES POLLEY

Gospel or ideology in South Africa? (2)

MARIE-LOUISE MARTIN

Prophetic Christianity in the Congo (3)

DAVID PERK

Christian-National education, the conscience clause and the church

Volume VII No.VI | Jaargang VII Nr.VI

Oct. 15 Okt.

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

PRO VERITATE

REDAKSIE

REDAKTEUR:

Dr. B. Engelbrecht.

REDAKSIONELE KOMITEE.

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

ADMINISTRASIE/ KORRESPONDENSIE

SIRKULASIEBESTUURDER.

Dr. W. B. de Villiers.

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

INTEKENGELD

Intekengeld is vooruitbetaalbaar.

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

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

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

LET WEL

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

PRO VERITATE verskyn elke 15de van die maand.

(Prys per enkel-eksemplaar 10c)

CHRISTELIKE MAANDBLAD VIR SUIDELIKE AFRIKA CHRISTIAN MONTHLY FOR SOUTHERN AFRICA

IN HIERDIE UITGAWE

- Dr. Calvin Cook, voorsitter van die Raad van Beheer van die Christelike Instituut van S.A., het by geleentheid van die vyfde jaarlikse algemene vergadering van die Instituut gepraat oor die hoop en frustrasies van „hierdie vyfjarige“. Bl. 3
- In die tweede aflewering van sy artikel „Gospel or Ideology in South Africa?“ bespreek eerw. James Polley die valse beginsel van rasse-skeiding in fisieke sin waarop die ideologiese heilsaanbod gebaseer is. Bl. 6
- In haar derde artikel oor die Kimbangu-kerk in die Kongo, skryf dr. Marie-Louise Martin oor die Kimbanguïste se toepassing van hulle beginsels op politieke aangeleenthede. Bl. 10
- Prof. B. B. Keet skryf oor die standpunt wat die Gereformeerde Kerk van Nederland onlangs, tydens die sitting van die Gereformeerde Ekumeniese Sinode, oor rasseverhoudinge ingeneem het. Bl. 13
- David Perk waarsku teen die nadelige gevolge van die Afrikaner se houding van uitsluiting, met besondere verwysing na die begrip Christelik-Nasionale onderwys en die opposisie teen die gewetenskousule in die konstitusies van sommige Suid-Afrikaanse universiteite. Bl. 14

IN THIS ISSUE...

- The Rev. Dr. Calvin Cook, Chairman of the Board of Management of the Christian Institute of S.A., spoke on some frustrations and hopes of "this five year old" on the occasion of the fifth annual general meeting of the Institute. P. 3
- In the second instalment of his article, Gospel or Ideology in South Africa? the Rev. James Polley discusses the false principle of physical racial separation on which the ideological offer of salvation is based. P. 6
- In her third article on the Kimbanguist Church in the Congo, Dr. Marie-Louise Martin writes about the Kimbanguist' application of their principles to political matters. P. 10
- Prof. B. B. Keet writes about the stand taken by the Reformed Church in Holland on race relations, at the meeting of the Reformed Ecumenical Synod which was recently held. P. 13
- David Perk warns against the catastrophic effects of the Afrikaner's attitude of exclusiveness, with special reference to the concept of Christian-National education and the opposition to the conscience clause in the constitutions of some South African universities. P. 14

Inleidingsartikel:

Reaksies op 'n Boodskap

Noudat die eerste beroering oor die S.A. Raad van Kerke se „Boodskap aan die Volk van Suid-Afrika” bedaar het, is dit insiggewend om te let op die reaksies wat dit aan dese en gene ontlok het.

En dan is dit dadelik opvallend dat daar byna onmiddellik wel so 'n groot en hewige mate van reaksie was — selfs tot in die hoogste regeringskringe. Dit is tekenend van die toestand van selfteenstrydigheid waarin ons hier in Suid-Afrika onself bevind dat so 'n relatief eenvoudige stelling van ooglopend Bybels-evangeliese waarhede so 'n opskudding moes veroorsaak. Ons beroem ons dan van ouds daarop dat ons s'n 'n Christenland is wat nog steeds regeer is volgens die maatstawwe van die Christelike sede. Vanwaar dan nou hierdie plotselinge verontrusting oor die eenvoudige herhaling van die sentrale waarhede van die evangelie in die taal van ons tyd? Of gaan dit vir ons as Christenvolk nie meer om die werklike evangeliewaarheid nie, maar slegs om wie dit verkondig en met watter sanksie — om die persoon, nie meer om die saak nie?

'n Tweede verskynsel wat opval, is dat die grote gros negatiewe reaksies tot dusver van die kant van politici en joernaliste gekom het, nie van die kant van kerke of kerkleiers nie. 'n Afwysing of verwerping op 'n Bybelse gronde moet nog deur die opstellers van die „Boodskap” ontvang word en word ook met spanning ingewag, omdat dit aanleiding kon gee tot die lang agterstallige geestesgesprek wat sou kon lei tot minstens 'n mate van eenstemmigheid onder ons tragies verdeelde kerke. Dog dit wil voorkom of daar, waarskynlik vanselfsprekend, geen Bybels-teologiese besware teen die „boodskap” in te bring is nie; sodat die diepgaande teologiese „kommentaar” oor die „Boodskap” wat kort op sy hakke uitgereik is, nouliks nodig gaan blyk te wees. Op **Bybelse** gronde, in elk geval, skyn hierdie stuk dan onaanvegbaar te wees.

Die mees diepgaande kritiek teen die „boodskap” wat tot dusver nog na vore gebring is, is dat dit nie ver genoeg gaan nie en nie ook, naas die aandui van die Christelike lewensrigting vir ons land, ingaan op die feitlikhede van ons rasse-situasie en praktiese alternatiewe vir dié wan-toestande en -praktyke waarteen dit op beginsel gekant is, verskaf nie.

Hierdie skynbaar grondige beswaar berus egter op 'n misvatting. Die „Boodskap” het vir eers nog 'n beperkte doel en beweeg gevolglik slegs op één vlak: die vlak van die prinsipiële. As eenvoudige herkonstatering van die evangeliese gehoorsaamheidsideaal rig dit hom teen die byna lynreg teenoorgestelde apartheidsideologie. Die ideologie van apartheid dui as valse evangelie vir Suid-Afrika 'n bepaalde en duidelik omlynde heilsrigting aan; die „Boodskap”, daarenteen, herinner slegs aan die

ware evangelie van Christus wat 'n eweseer duidelik omlynde heilsrigting aandui, wat feitlik direk die teenoorgestelde is as dié wat deur die profete van „afsonderlike ontwikkeling” verkondig word.

Wanneer dit egter by die praktiese toepassing van albei hierdie „lewensrigtinge” kom, is die saak lank nie so eenvoudig nie.

Daar is oorgenoeg en steeds toenemende bewyse dat die apartheidsideologie in die praktyk net eenvoudig nie slaag nie — tot toenemende onsteltenis van selfs sy getrouste voorstanders en aanhangers. Die heilstaat van apartheid is 'n ydele hersenskim bedag op 'n Suid-Afrikaanse hemel-op-aarde of Utopie, wat soos alle Utopieë bestem is om in duie te stort sodra pogings aangewend word om dit te grondves op die harde rots van die werklikheid.

Met die Christendom is dit anders gesteld. Ook hier bestaan daar 'n skynbaar onoorbrugbare kloof tussen die ideaal en die werklikheid. Dog in die Christelike geloofsleer word dit ook in aanmerking geneem en word daarvoor voorsiening gemaak. Die Christen word immers enersyds nie geleer om 'n hemel op aarde te verwag nie: Gods koninkryk kom nog in sy volheid. Andersyds egter glo hy tog dat die kloof tussen ideaal en werklikheid reeds in Christus oorbrug is, dat selfs die praktiese werklikheid van die sonde met sy verdelende mag reeds deur Hom oorwin is. Ons Christelike lewe kan dus slegs een wees van geleidelike heiligmaking gerig op die voleinding, wat onvermydelik ook impliseer 'n daaglikse en voortdurende korpromis tussen geloofsideaal en praktiese werklikheid.

Dit is egter ongetwyfeld waar dat die kerk in Suid-Afrika — in direkte teenstelling met die verwyf wat onlangs deur die Eerste Minister na hom geslinger is — in die versoeking verval het om gans te veel aandag te wy aan die op die oog af onwêreldse geloofsideaal, en gans te min aan die sondige praktiese werklikheid. En waar die geloofsideaal nou weer eens so klinkklaar en finaal gestel is in die „Boodskap”, sal daar van nou af met mening werk gemaak moet word met die praktiese werklikheid in al sy sondigheid en onvolmaaktheid, al moet daar ook hoeveel kompromisse in die proses verduur word.

En dan sal die eerste stap seker moet wees vir Christene in Suid-Afrika om, as Christene, hulle eie huis in orde te stel: om daarop aan te dring dat die kerk in Suid-Afrika so spoedig moontlik sal ophou om uit sovele verskillende monde te spreek; en om toe te sien dat die gewone Christenlidmate van ons Christelike kerke in die praktyk begin beoefen wat hul geestelike leiers nou al vir soveel jare knaend besig is om te predik.

Dat daar nog ernstige en uiters veroordelenswaardige leemtes bestaan in ons praktiese beoefening van dit wat gepredik word, durf egter onder geen omstandighede as 'n verskoning aangevoer word vir die verstomming van die prediking nie. Met profetiese ywer moet die kerk die onafgewaterde evangelie van Christus bly verkondig en ook vreesloos en ondubbelsinnig die enigste lewens-

rigting bly aandui wat op die evangelie gebaseer is. Dié kerk wat, om watter rede ook al, ophou om duidelik en onomwonde te spreek in die Naam van die Here, selfs dan ook teenoor die owerheid, haal nog 'n erger oordeel oor homself en staan veroordeel voor die oë van God en van die mens.

W. B. de V.

Editorial:

Reactions to a Message

Now that the first stir caused by the S.A. Council of Churches' "Message to the People of South Africa" has quietened down it is instructive to take note of the reactions which it elicited in various quarters.

And then one is immediately struck by the fact that almost at once there was indeed such considerable and intense reaction — even in the highest circles of government. It is typical of the state of self-contradictoriness in which we here in South Africa find ourselves that such a relatively simple statement of obviously Biblical and evangelical truth should have caused such a minor uproar. Surely we have been priding ourselves from time immemorial on ours being a Christian country which has, right along, been governed according to the standards of Christian morality. Why, then, this sudden agitation about the simple restatement of the central truths of the gospel in the language of our time? Or are we as a so-called Christian people no longer concerned about the real truth of the gospel, but only with him who proclaims it and with the sanction with which he does so — with the person, no longer with the principle?

A second phenomenon that strikes one is that the large majority of negative reactions thus far have come from politicians and journalists, not from churches or church leaders. The authors of the "Message" must still receive a denial or rejection on genuinely Biblical grounds, and are anxiously awaiting it because it could give rise to the long overdue spiritual dialogue which might lead to at least a measure of unanimity among our sadly divided churches. It would, however, seem as if, probably as a matter of course, no Biblical and theological complaints are to be lodged against the "Message", but only political objections; so that the profound theological "commentary" on the "Message" which was issued shortly afterwards is going to prove to be hardly necessary. On **biblical** grounds, in any case, this document appears to be unassailable.

The most profound criticism of the "Message" which has been brought to the fore thus far is that it does not go far enough and that it does not also, apart from indicating the Christian way of life for our country, go in upon the practicalities of our

racial situation and provide alternatives for those evils and malpractices to which it is opposed on principle.

This ostensibly well-founded objection is based on a misconception, however. The "Message" has a limited objective for the time being and consequently on one plane only: the plane of principle. As a simple restatement of the Gospel's ideal of obedience it sets itself against the almost directly opposed ideology of apartheid. The ideology of apartheid as a false gospel points towards a particular and clearly defined way of salvation for South Africa; the "Message", by contrast, is merely a reminder of the true gospel of Christ which points towards an equally clearly defined way of salvation leading in an almost directly opposite direction to the one proclaimed by the prophets of "separate development".

When, however, it comes to the practical application of both these "ways of life", it is by no means such a simple matter.

There is more than enough and steadily mounting evidence that the ideology of apartheid simply does not succeed in practice — to the mounting dismay of even its most loyal proponents and adherents. The perfect society of apartheid is a silly figment of the imagination aimed at a South African heaven-upon-earth or Utopia, which, like all Utopias, is destined to crumble as soon as attempts are made to base it upon the hard rock of reality.

It is a different situation in the case of Christianity. Here, too, there exists an apparently unbridgeable gulf between ideal and reality. But this is taken into account and provided for in the Christian doctrine of faith. For, on the one hand, the Christian is not taught to expect a heaven upon earth: the Kingdom of God is still to come in all its fulness. On the other hand, however, he nevertheless believes that the gulf between ideal and reality has already been bridged in Christ, that even the practical reality of sin with its divisive power has been conquered by Him. Our Christian life can, therefore, only be one of a gradual growing in grace directed towards the ultimate fulfilment, which inevitably also implies a daily and continuous compromise between the ideal of faith and practical reality.

It is undoubtedly true, however, that the Church in South Africa — in direct contrast to the reproach recently flung at it by the Prime Minister — has succumbed to the temptation to give far too much attention to the ostensibly unworldly ideal of faith, and far too little to sinful practical reality. And where the ideal of faith has now once again been so clearly and finally outlined in the "Message", practical reality in all its sinfulness and imperfection will henceforth have to be dealt with in all seriousness, however many compromises will have to be endured in the process.

And then the first step will surely have to be for Christians in South Africa, as Christians, to put their own house in order: to insist that the Church in South Africa should cease as soon as possible to speak with so many different voices; and to see

to it that the ordinary Christian laymen of our Christian churches should really start practising what their spiritual leaders have monotonously been preaching for so many years.

That there are still serious and utterly condemnable deficiencies in our practising what is preached dare under no circumstances, however, be advanced as an excuse for the silencing of preaching. The Church must keep on proclaiming the unadulterated Gospel of Christ with prophetic zeal and must keep on pointing fearlessly and unambiguously towards the only way of life which is based upon this Gospel. That church which, for whatever reason, ceases to speak out clearly and candidly in the Name of the Lord, even to the government, brings an even greater judgment upon itself and stands condemned before the eyes of God and of men.

W. B. de V.

Some Frustrations and Hopes of This Five Year Old *

— DR. CALVIN COOK

One of the myths of the Cook family concerns one of its five year old members. He was carrying in one hand a ball; with the other hand he dragged a train on the end of a string. Ahead loomed a closed door. It did not open as he approached. So he kicked it and cursed: "Damn that door". Neither of his parents swore, in his presence or out of it. They were startled. Secularization had thus made its appearance in the language of the lower deck. It had been revealed by frustration and issued in violence. But the violence opened no doors.

The Christian Institute is five tonight. We give thanks for this milestone, and for the road behind us. But we should also use the opportunity to think about what has been learned during this time, or at least revealed by the time, even if not learned. The present language of the Institute might startle some of its founding fathers. The Institute was born to the strains of Woolwich's idyll. We now march to James Philip Moulder. This is a sign of growth and of development; it may or may not be progress. What I would like to do this evening is to review our growth in terms of certain frustrations we have met, because with Paul I believe that we (along with creation) have been subjected to futility in order that we (along with creation) may also be subject to hope. First, then, some of the frustrations we can see all too clearly; thereafter, when our eyes have become accustomed to the light (or dark), some of the hopes.

1. Inter-church relationships

One reason for founding the Christian Institute was the feeling that since direct inter-church relationships had broken down, there might be some means of communication via the backstairs of personal influence and contact. We had seen both the possibilities of inter-church co-operation, and the great difficulties, particularly the very narrow limits within which denominations were prepared to work together. Could the Institute go further, individually and unofficially than where the churches had bogged down?

Our experience has been frustrating. Churches are still bogged down. Union committees find their drafts like hydras: lop off one difficulty and two take its place. God has not finished his reckoning with the churches. They face changes a good deal more drastic than those they hope to get by with. But meanwhile, we work not only with denominational peculiarity, but with denomination-

al idiocy as well. The frustration of the Institute is by no means as acute as that of the South African Council of Churches, which, despite its recent change of name finds itself in the position of a nervous system that has been dissected out of its body. It twitches to all manner of external and internal stimuli, but seldom moves the body into action. So far, we have been shielded from such a fate by novelty and inspiration. But no one can assume that the sensations which have kept us on the front page on Sundays will continue. We shall gradually drift from eminence and notoriety to the bottoms of columns. This slump may cause the frustration of some to grow.

2. Inter-racial aims and intentions

The second line of frustration arises from our inter-racial aims and intentions. We have discovered how effectively apartheid blocks inter-racial contact, even with the best of good will. My pass to Soweto lapsed through my carelessness. I forgot to renew something I had not been called to use anyway. The fellowship in our groups is strictly limited by almost incompatible time-tables. In spite of our belief that we whites were ready to learn and needed to know, we have not found an unending

stream of black or coloured tutors.

Yet the most important development is also the most potentially frustrating of all. We looked towards inter-racial rapprochement between races in mainline denominations. Unexpectedly, most of our development has occurred in the opposite direction — towards the independent African Churches. Since their *raison d'être* is in part the failure of our missions to represent the gospel adequately, we can expect a good deal of frustration, particularly when we find that our assumption, that increased contact with these groups or further education will tone down some of the "wilder" theologies blows up on facts. The demand may well be that we change, not they. Attempt for instance a defence of the current practice of infant baptism before a group of such ministers, and the conclusion they draw about us is that perversely we prefer cultural tradition to scripture. Even if they have never heard of him, they have on their side the greatest and most influential of all contemporary theologians!

3. A third area of frustration is our groups. These have not achieved all we hoped of them. Each step they take towards more real fellowship and solidarity, they give grounds for suspicion that they are taking over the proper work of the church. What else is to be done when churches claim this ground yet leave it undeveloped? At present, there is no denomination that can be anything more than a sect: yet this admission would be disputed by all. How can we expect meaningful repentance until this is faced? The church is where two or three are gathered in his name and he meets with them. His presence and that of a brother are the essential components: to them belongs the whole kingdom. Meanwhile, we face the frustrations of fellowship brought about by our failure to recognize this or to admit the causes that limit our fellowship. Because charity is missing, we cannot discern the body with clarity; and for all the appearances of roistering good health, the true condition is sometimes one of sickness and death.

4 Then there is our connexion with churches overseas. The Institute hoped to help preserve this link which was in danger of being lost. Here we have met frustration too: from being the bright hope on the

ecumenical horizon, the Institute has slumped to the problematic status of being the least bad of a poor bunch. We have been given a great deal of financial and moral support. How frustrating to those who have shown such faith that we have produced so little to justify their hopes. Some hoped for explosions: we have engineered none. Others hoped that we might get things moving. The Nationalist party has done at least as much. There is a growing suspicion that our influence was like King Log: one big splash, then a few ripples, and finally a tranquil pond once more. Despite the Institute, South Africa remains the most stable country in Africa: a financiers' dream. Again, the close scrutiny of the Institute's affairs showed that the fears of Professor Pont were completely unjustified: what he saw in the dark was not even a paper tiger; it was a domestic tabby. We seem headed for the limbo that awaits the politically unsuccessful: will Beyers Naudé end up in some niche alongside the shades of Tielman Roos and Robey Leibbrandt? We have simply not matched the mixed expectations of overseas churches, and so their interest is not what it was, while we have found their unilateral pronouncements and actions similarly frustrating to our interest.

5. Finally there is the frustration of realizing that the Kingdom of God remains as hidden as ever in the Republic. We have been as certain that it could not be identified with apartheid as our brethren have been certain that this is the indispensable factor for its coming. They continue to urge, despite our contentions, that not only have mountains to be levelled, and valleys filled, but walls need to be built in preparation for the kingdom.

In turn, we have had to realize that the preaching of equality is not necessarily the way to finding community with another. Equality can only be applied to artificial and formal situations such as standing before the law. Everywhere else we face the far more exacting demand that we be aware of differences and able to discriminate. Which has been the source of more frustration: the assumption that people who share the same labels may be treated alike, or that those who have different ones must be treated differently? The Institute, along with other groups, despite being equipped with the four-wheel drive

of knowledgeable intent and lightness of structure has found itself bogged down no less certainly in the sands of our false social assumption than any of our more ancient or venerable institutions. We have heard the parables of the kingdom, and like others, not understood them, nor known where or how to turn and be converted.

* * *

I hope that this picture is not exaggerated. Weigh up our activities, and a cynic would discover that our income and expenditure approximate a smallish lingerie firm, and its products are hardly less flimsy or see-through. Is there any sign of the hope that is the purpose of futility and frustration?

1. The first consequence has been the destruction of shallow and false optimisms. At first, every army takes the field in dress uniform, with flags waving. Then it discovers the enemy is tougher, braver, cleverer, meaner and more purposeful than it ever gave him credit for being. The walls of apartheid have not collapsed, despite repeated blasts from "Pro Veritate". We face a real crisis, because we cannot continue as we are; nor can we be certain of support as hitherto on the road ahead, since this seems to lead to an abyss. Anyone within the security of an institution can fire unanswerable questions at us concerning our methods and goals. We can take cover in institutional futility. We can blow up in frustration. Or through our frustration we may come to understand true hope, and be haunted and inspired by it.

What then is this glorious liberty of the children of God which Paul calls our hope? Quite clearly it takes us far beyond the sharknets we have erected so that we may swim without risk in the ocean of grace. The hope of such a liberty will take us a good deal further in the struggle both with and for the church and state than we have so far gone. Not so much by what we say, but by what we are by the grace of God, we shall threaten existing structures of both institutions in so far as these are not formed by grace. Denominations at the moment are bent on preserving denominational differences and their own traditions while at the same time claiming to be the church. A party claims to be the state. Because each lacks wholeness, it lacks liberty as well. And as long as it fears liberty, it will lack wholeness.

Churchwise, for instance, no one is yet in a position to say whether Bishop Burnett, functioning as secretary of the South African Council of Churches is a figure of hope for the future, or an anachronism like the Britannia: an ecumenical turbo-prop in a time when denominational airlines are all investing in jets. The role of the Institute is to remind those who live as if their denomination were the church, that this is not true. For the position even of Rome against the seemingly most headstrong African sect is only one of a relative, and not of an absolute wholeness.

2. Will ecumenical frustration drive us then to recover our hope of a universal mission? Here we may note that South Africa habitually thinks of itself as a receiving rather than as a sending nation. The government believes we have reached saturation point with religious workers from abroad. Perhaps we should agree, and not only deny ourselves these visitors, but also make available some of our own people for service abroad. Compared with certain areas of the world, we are overstocked.

We may think of the amazing work of an earlier generation of D.R.C. missionaries who were active throughout Africa. The present picture is of a failure of nerve that has affected not only this great church, but ourselves as well. One indisputable perversion that can be attributed to apartheid is that it has narrowed the obligation to go to all nations to going to one's own. God may indeed send us to our own; but we cannot prescribe this for ourselves. In a world war, enlistment for one continent simply will not do.

We are told that there is a new outward look. We have discovered neighbours on our borders. But where are the people to be found who can staff the superior peace corps for which "Current Affairs" pled the other evening? Why should anyone renounce the incomparable benefits of this country for anywhere else? It took persecution to drive the Christians from Jerusalem to Samaria. We almost need such a credential again these days. But who thinks of this as hope?

3. This brings me to a third point. For a long time now, disciples have quarrelled with one another. We have compared our fates. We have also indulged in prescribing crosses for others. This is a mania of con-

temporary ecumenics. We still need criteria to distinguish evangelical theology from Afro-Asian politics, as much as our D.R.C. brethren need criteria to distinguish evangelical theology from nationalist politics. Christ pointed to his presence in the claims of the needy. Are they then identical? Evangelical theology begins not at the point of the self-righteousness of the poor, but at what God has done, and needed to do, for the sin of rich and poor alike.

The demand that others sacrifice is not the way of Christ. He emptied himself freely. The one who denies himself and takes up his cross must do so of his own accord if he is to be a disciple. In such sacrifice lay the origin of the Institute. The work of the Institute will only continue as long as this is practised by its members. We can neither choose our crosses, nor prescribe them for others. We may be certain however, that the demand will come in his time and his way to each of us, and to all of us.

Some of our members are deeply troubled because they live so comfortably while others have so little. But the word to John differs from the word to Peter. After the meeting with the Risen Lord at the lakeside, Peter could be sure that one day he would literally have to bear the cross. But to his last day, John wondered what would happen to him. Last of the twelve, he most probably died in his bed. Nothing is more difficult to handle within any community than this diversity of gifts and diversity of destinies. It so easily degenerates into complacency and envy. Yet it also holds the possibility and hope of a fellowship and a partnership as willing to give as to receive. Here perhaps is a word of hope in our relationships with overseas churches. They are as frustrated by their impotence as we are by ours. We must not complicate the situation further by becoming exasperated with them as some of them are with us. Exasperation is the companion of frustration in the same way as patient love is of hope. We must press on till exasperation gives way to patience, and frustration to hope.

4. A fourth point concerns our incarnation. Words are short-circuited from the realities they signify. So life becomes increasingly theatrical. Listen to our language: drama, role-play, acting, performances, curtains. Being is dissociated from action. All

forms of community are affected. People are thus critical of all kinds of community and seek to unmask the facade. The problem is not new: Jesus took the ordinary word for actor and turned it into the strongest condemnation: hypocrite. A hypocrite is someone who only acts: he is not what he plays.

This is a standing temptation for us all. We meet together, and can be just so many actors. Concern ceases when the show is over and we go home.

What is the remedy? It is obedience to the Spirit. The Spirit incarnates. He alone brings word and flesh together. For all our talk of involvement, we are in danger of thinking that being concerned with God means only being concerned with our neighbour. Only the discipline of the Spirit can ensure that the body follows the lead of the Spirit instead of the lead of the flesh. We must face more realistically than we have done, the fact that our brethren have rejected us because we seemed hypocrites. We acted as if we were concerned with their whole being, their eternal destiny; we may only have been concerned with their votes.

5. My final point I hardly understand myself. It is the invisibility of true hope. "Who hopes for what he sees?" Could it be that expectations and hopes are all too visible and therefore false? Note the problem. The D.R.C.'s identified themselves with political, social and cultural aspirations of their people. They moved towards highly visible hopes, which, now largely attained, have left the church almost goalless. It seeks to protect what has been won rather than to press towards the mark of the upward call of God in Christ. How can we define our hope and make it credible without at the same time making it visible and therefore not hope? This is perhaps the most urgent task of theologians today — and that means us all. We assume that visibility means credibility; Jesus blessed the faith that did not see yet believed.

Such a word sends us back to a realm where our lives are once again exposed to questioning. (The five year old is in danger of having arrived: we still enjoy a dangerous prestige overseas; and we are beginning to be listened to at home.) To set our minds on an invisible hope exposes us to much criticism: we are neurotic, escapist, otherworldly, irrelevant, and

all the rest of the contemporary swear words. But if we are going to be faithful to our witness to the Word Incarnate, we must speak as he did, of a kingdom that was invisible to the practitioners of real-politik, assured of its power more certainly than of any manifestations of power on earth; certain enough to suffer to the end for its glory. Certainty is demonstrated more surely in suffering than in violence, since violence is always unsure of itself.

In this way we witness to the hope that the glorious liberty of the children of God is liberty formed by Christ himself; his freedom to give without reserve and without coercion. More: we shall have to insist with all our being as well as with our words, on the sovereignty of grace as the prime element in the sovereignty of God. For the only way we can be

sure of the sovereignty of God is when we meet this in grace. For where sinners are, and where death is, there we meet God for sure. We wait then for the redemption of our bodies, for the resurrection of the dead. Because this is our hope, we need not be as fearful of the possibilities of things present or things to come as are those whose hope is only in the visible and the present. We know that nothing can separate us from the love of God in Christ. Nor need we be so set on the achievement of visible hopes because we know that it does not profit a man to gain the whole world, if by doing this, he loses a life whose hope was of an eternal destiny, and finds that Beelzebub has allowed him his little game of revolution within a safely defined sphere of demonic influence.

Is this vague? All I know is that if I try to make such a hope more

specific or more visible, I become another speculator offering you a leasehold, jerry-built shack, in which your tenure depends upon conformity to present fashions, when our God-given privilege is a dwelling place in the city of God. But as to which of these is preferable: gospel, or pseudo-gospel, is a choice that depends upon our own meeting with the living God. We know that he is alive because he raises the dead; that he is God, because he does this for us. It is he that has made our frustration the measure and the demonstration of the magnitude and the substance of our hope.

*(*Address delivered on the occasion of the annual general meeting of the Christian Institute of Southern Africa, Johannesburg, 13th August, 1968.)*

Gospel or Ideology in South Africa?

— THE REV. JAMES A. POLLEY

In this article we turn to the second false principle on which the ideological offer of salvation is based, namely that of physical racial separation. In doing so I would first like to provide a brief outline of the extensive attempt to segregate people on the basis of their racial identity; then show why this attempt is rejected by the gospel of Jesus Christ.

Until 1948 the people of South Africa were seeking a way of life *together*. After that the search was abandoned together with the idea of sharing a common homeland. The new government instituted what we might call divorce proceedings which were designed to bring about the total separation of the family members of our society. This divorce would result in the division of our common homeland into about six mini-tribal states. Somehow, life together in the same home was considered too much of a threat to some members of the family, so the rest had to get out.

I THE GREAT DIVORCE

The foundations for the divorce were laid by the comprehensive system of race classification described in the previous article. On this

basis the high legal walls were raised that would separate races in South Africa at every conceivable level. This process is best demonstrated by focussing on the major legislation in the five basic structures of society.

(a) *Interpersonal*:-

The process was introduced in 1949 by the Prohibition of Mixed Marriages Act. It curtailed the freedom of South Africans to marry whom they desired, and barred them from ever living in their own country should they marry against this legislation. Hence a gifted Afrikaner poet and cultural leader like Breyten Breytenbach can never return with his wife because she is Vietnamese.

We note that the act embodies a principle which is rejected by all major Christian churches in the world. The Cottesloe conference as well as the council of recent Reformed churches' meeting in Lunteren, Holland, stand by this theological position.

The Immorality Act followed in 1950, making it an offence to solicit, or conspire, or to have carnal intercourse between White and non-White. The great tragedy about this

hypocritical attempt at sexual separation is that each year the number of prosecutions is about double the number of convictions.

(b) *Socio-Cultural*:-

The most agonising piece of legislation in the entire divorce is aptly described by the title of Alan Paton's booklet dealing with it:- "The People Wept"! The Group Areas Act of 1950 provides the machinery, "by compulsion, if necessary, for physical separation of defined groups for residential purposes and trade". Under the same authority Africans have been divided on a tribal basis in the townships. In 1957 the Act was amended so as to prohibit non-Whites from attending a public cinema, licensed restaurant, tea room, or visiting any club in a particular group area except under permit.

It is quite impossible to give an adequate description of the massive movements of people which this act set in motion. There is even less chance of providing an honest picture of the great suffering brought upon thousands of its victims; for the human destruction involved in the loss of freehold property, family

homes, trade, careers and security, is simply indescribable. Indeed, this act has been monstrously effective, making it virtually impossible for White and non-White to have general social, cultural or religious contact.

The Reservation of Separate Amenities Act of 1953 made possible the segregation of any public premises or public vehicle. Such action was not to be ruled invalid on the ground that provision was not made for all races or that the separate facilities provided were not substantially equal. So the doctrine of "separate but unequal" became enshrined in South African law. In 1960 an amendment provided for the enforcement of apartheid on beaches.

In 1955 the Motor Carrier Transportation Amendment Act provided the means to enforce apartheid on transport services. An amendment in 1959 extended this ruling to taxi services in the Cape and Natal. Such discrimination already existed in the O.F.S. and Transvaal. On 12 February, 1965, the State President issued a Proclamation R26 which amended the 1960 Amendment to the Group Areas Act, under Section 1, subsection 4. This Proclamation virtually imposed complete apartheid on "any place of public entertainment". This covered sporting activities, cinemas, concerts in civic halls, agricultural shows, etc. An occasional exception is allowed by special permit and non-Whites are allowed to watch provincial and international cricket and rugby matches if separate facilities are provided.

Towards the end of 1962 the Government informed professional and scientific organisations which were in receipt of subsidies that unless they amended their constitutions in such a way as to exclude non-Whites from membership their subsidies would be terminated. After protest and consultation a compromise was reached. Those societies which wished to accept non-White members would continue to do so, but would help the non-Whites to eventually form their own associations.

(c) Educational:-

The Bantu Education Act of 1953 gave the Minister unrestricted powers to decide what schools should exist, what conditions of service for teachers should be and what the content of African education should be. It is quite clear now that this legis-

lation has not raised the standard of education and that it has destroyed all possibility of non-racial education.

The Extension of University Education Act of 1959 was a tremendous blow to higher education, human relations and qualified leadership in South Africa. It excluded non-Whites from the open universities and made possible the establishment of segregated colleges (on ethnic lines) for non-Whites. Not only did this act destroy academic freedom in South Africa, but also the possibility of fruitful academic and cultural contact and dialogue between white and non-White students.

(d) The Economic:-

The Native Building Workers Act of 1951 provided for segregation in the building industry. The Native Labour (Settlement of Disputes) Act of 1953 redefined the term "employee" in the Industrial Conciliation Act of 1924 to exclude all Africans. It thereby prevented registered trade unions from having African members and prohibited strikes by African workers or sympathetic strikes by workers of other racial groups. It also provided for separate industrial structures by which Africans were to settle labour disputes.

The Industrial Conciliation Act of 1956 prohibited the registration of any further "mixed" trade unions (catering for white and Coloured or Asian members). It was also laid down that any mixed unions which continued to exist must create separate branches for white and non-white members and hold separate meetings. Provision was also made for "job reservation", that is, for specified types of work to be reserved for persons of a specified racial group — used mainly as a safeguard for white workers.

An amendment in 1959 laid down that mixed trade unions could not extend their interests unless they did so in respect of one racial group only. It was also rendered illegal for employees to collect trade union dues from Africans.

The Nursing Act of 1957 laid down that the Nursing Council, which deals with the registration, training and discipline of nurses, must consist of white persons only. The Nursing Association was required to set up separate branches for each racial group and to arrange separate meetings. The Council was

to keep separate registers of nurses according to their race.

The Factories, Machinery and Building Work Amendment Act of 1960 provided for the rigid segregation of factory workers. It therefore completed the pattern laid down by the original act in which provision was made for separate accommodation, facilities and conveniences.

(e) Political:-

Political separation took a dramatic turn in 1951 with the passing of the Bantu Authorities Act which abolished the Natives Representative Council and provided for the establishment of tribal, regional and territorial Bantu authorities in the reserves. In 1959 a further Act was passed which abolished Parliamentary representation of Africans and provided for the appointment of initially five commissioners-general to represent the government. The Transkei Constitution Act of 1963 provided for the election of a Transkeian Assembly.

In 1951 the Separate Representation of Voter's Bill was introduced to remove the Coloured vote from the common roll and place the voters of these 55 constituencies on a separate roll. After a shameful six year constitutional battle in which the constitution was virtually wrecked, this goal was achieved. The Bill was validated by way of the High Court of Parliament Act of 1952, the Senate Act of 1955 and the South Africa Act Amendment of 1956.

The Prohibition of Improper Interference Act of 1968 brought the entire process of political separation to its final conclusion. It provided for rigid racial segregation in terms of membership of political parties, assistance in voter registration, finance, propaganda, or any of the activities featuring in a political party or similar organisation. As a result the multi-racial Liberal Party disbanded and the Progressive Party had to become a 'Whites only' body. *In this way the vast pyramid of a legally segregated society has been built up on the basis of racial identity.* Furthermore, it is quite clear that the entire legal system of racial separation has put fresh emphasis on racial, tribal and cultural differences, focussing the attention of society on these factors. The race-consciousness of South Africans has thus been increased by

this, giving birth to increasing prejudice, fear, false images of the other group and consequent estrangement.

However, whoever takes the gospel of Jesus seriously is placed in an extremely serious dilemma by this system: for the followers of Jesus simply cannot do the mental trick demanded of all South Africans. It is a preposterous demand — that is, to call this cinemascope-sized divorce being played out daily on the vast human screen of our society, our salvation! To do so would be blasphemy! For the gospel of Jesus rejects this system as immoral on at least five grounds. Let us now examine them.

II THE GOSPEL AND SEPARATION

We begin by noting that it is simply not good enough to object to the system of enforced racial separation on the grounds that it forces men apart, whereas the Christian gospel brings them together. The ideology's reply to this is that it separates men for the sake of reconciling them. It insists on having the same objective as the gospel, namely reconciliation. Whilst its final picture of reconciliation differs from that of the gospel, it argues strongly that the reason for this is as follows: the only way to stabilise and reconcile race relationships in a situation of many nationalisms is to put each national group on an equal footing of independent nationhood.

This then is the ideology, and we note that (whether the government likes the word or not), this is a form of *partition*. It is a concept which, as John Dugard recently pointed out, "is especially inherent in its (the Government's) Bantustan policy" (New Nation, July, 1968, p. 2). It is also a concept which has enjoyed the support of some of the most prominent Afrikaner intellectuals and theorists! It has often been confirmed as the ideal by many government leaders, including the late Dr. H. Verwoerd. He said (in the Assembly on 5 February, 1965.):

"... the crux of the policy of separation is political separation . . . Territorial separation is important in the sense that the further one can develop it, the greater are the chances of having good relations and of avoiding conflict." (Hansard 2, cols. 613-636).

Clearly the aim is still a form of partition, although the territorial

practicability of it is in some doubt. Nevertheless, the basis of the ideology is that conflict between the races can be avoided by total political separation and as much territorial separation as possible. This argument rests on the sociological principle of removing one of the parties from the conflict-situation so that the ensuing separation may facilitate good relations.

However, partition, in whatever "party dress", rests on two principles of equal significance. First, the sociological principle of separating the conflicting parties from one another so as to avoid further conflict. Second, the socio-political principle of ensuring a just division of territory, opportunity and resources acceptable to both parties, that is, the implementation of the extensive socio-political commitments on which the separation is based. According to Professor Gwendolyn Carter there are three basic requirements to this². I will mention them in a rearranged order, first partition is only to be brought about on the basis of extensive consultation between the leaders of all groups concerned, and not by white determination alone. (This would involve dialogue with the real national leaders of the African people, most of whom are in prison). Second the equitable distribution of land, of existing urban and economic resources, of port facilities and communications. Third, all areas to have access to the outside world by means of air rights etc. It is at this point that we can bring the gospel to bear on the system and identify the reasons why the latter is rejected. There are basically two sets of reasons — the moral-pragmatic and the theological — both sets related to Christian morality. We will note four moral-pragmatic reasons and one theological, in that order.

1. *There has been no consultation:*

The Whites in power have *not consulted* with the real leaders of any of the other racial groups. Now consultation is a basic necessity in terms of the New Testament concept of reconciliation — what M. Buber calls "meeting" or "dialogue".

It is a blatant fact that the conception, development and imposition of apartheid, and the Bantustan policy particularly, is a product of the caucus of the Nationalist party. So for example, the most eminent

leaders of the African people were refused consultation when they went to see Dr. Eiselen, the new Secretary for Native Affairs, in 1948. He made it clear to them, the Native Representative Council, that they had no right to discuss matters of a political nature. Apparently no African leaders could make political representations. The Methodist Church had a similar experience in 1960 when it appealed to the Government to arrange for consultation in the form of a national convention. It was refused in shocking terms! As a consequence, this authoritarian attitude and irresponsible use of power has led to the policy having to be enforced. Its continued existence is clearly not due to the consent of the people but to the abundance of totalitarian legislation and the efficiency of the police, security branch and the military.

2. *There has not been an equitable distribution of land, resources or political power.*

There has been an attempt at this but it has been woefully inadequate. Whether one takes the requirements of the Tomlinson commission or any of the last twenty budgets as a standard of judgement, the conclusions arrived at are exactly the same, and all of them gloomy. The 1968 budget for example discloses that R376 million will be spent on defence, police and prisons, whilst a mere R13 million will go to the Transkeian government (including the salaries of white officials).

With regard to the land question, 63% of the people have been given only 13.7% of the land; and the political power given the non-whites is severely limited by the over-arching authority of the white government, which still has the final say. As there has been no realistic sharing of urban, industrial and economic resources, we cannot but conclude that there is no intention of taking the second principle of partition seriously. It has been ignored.

What has happened is that the first principle has been implemented to the full, whilst the second has received no more than token support. After twenty years in power the ideologists have honed their sword of separation to a razor edge, splitting every possible straw of inter-racial contact in the process. But almost nothing has been done

about the second principle in comparison, and that is clearly immoral.

3. *Partition is not taken seriously because it is either impracticable or merely a "front", or both.*

The evidence above substantiates these as the only possible two reasons for the abandonment of the second principle of partition. We note that there is strong and mounting evidence which demonstrates conclusively that the creation of six more mini-states is quite impossible. Factors like the failure of influx control to stop the flow of Africans to the cities, the acute labour shortage and the great difficulty involved in consolidating the reserves into Bantustans are prominent factors. At the 1967 congress of S.A.B.R.A. for instance, the Deputy Minister of Bantu Administration, Mr. A. H. Vosloo, acknowledged this problem when he pointed out that as a consequence, "various (Bantu) groups might have more than one geographical territory as their homeland". This was confirmed by Mr. G. F. van L. Froneman M.P., now a Deputy Minister, who stated that cultural consolidation was more important than geographical consolidation³. Add to this the fact that the ideology was still faced with a total of 438 black spots covering 757,137 morgen in June 1963, and you recognise that the Transkei was probably both the first and last Bantustan.

It may be that partition is not taken seriously, not only because of these pragmatic problems, but because the real objective of the ideology is not the salvation of the "nations" of South Africa at all, but rather the for-all-time survival of white supremacy. There is a good deal of persuasive evidence in government statements and in a sociological analysis of the policy to show that the real objective is in fact the maintenance and development of white economic interests and power. This objective is only possible by way of white supremacy as the honest Dr. Verwoerd often stated. It is an objective however, which clearly needed a sophisticated front so as to give it the credibility needed in terms of international and public relations. The front selected was that of an ideology cloaked in the policy of separate development, and behind which the interests of white economic power could be religiously worked for. This highly sophisticated front

has made possible the complete control of the entire process of social change in South Africa, and in turn has enabled those in power to consolidate their position and influence.

If this is true (and I suggest that it is), *it means that the respectable policy of separate development is in fact no more than a system of racial discrimination and exploitation in support of white supremacy. This is clearly rejected by the gospel.* So also is the pursuit of an objective known to be impracticable (the Bantustan policy) — for to do that is immoral.

4. *The extent of human suffering caused by the system of racial separation is totally unjustifiable.*

There is a reasonable point in any moral system where it is clear that "noble" ends simply do not justify the means and their grievous consequences.

The reason for this is that reconciliation is generally only possible where the parties concerned respect each others dignity. Whilst the government claims to do this, it is not evident in practice. The means used by the ideology dehumanise so many thousands of people and destroy so much human dignity, that reconciliation is virtually impossible.

We recognise that those of us whose present security is tied up with the preservation of the status quo may not be aware of this; but those whose lives have been scarred by the system know that their dignity has been destroyed. And it is no comfort to tell them that one day their "lost" dignity will be restored as it has only been temporarily suspended by the "pinpricks" of the system. That is just so much white supremacist rhetoric!

I have not quoted any of the many statistics to make this point because it has been done many times before. Organisations like the S.A.I.R. and Black Sash, writers like Alan Paton and Laurence Gandar, have supplied ample firsthand information to make the indictment a shocking one. However, I want to emphasise instead how fruitless these excellent attempts have been; fruitless because white South Africans generally find the facts so overwhelming that they have an impulsive reaction to them — rejecting them. Most of us find the facts so frightening that we cannot cope. Like Buchenwald of old they

gape at us with challenging horror — crying out at our apathy, seeking to cut through our indifference so as to reach our humanity. But it is too much for most of us, for such knowledge brings with it the obligation of action . . . and we fear that kind of involvement. The tragedy is that it is precisely this kind of inaction that is seen as justification for the continued pursuit of racial separation, in spite of the terrible toll of suffering involved.

5. Finally, *the Christian concept of reconciliation is committed to overcoming all barriers, whether*

of partition (in Cyprus or the Transkei), race or class etc. The Christian has been given the task of reconciling men to God and to one another. He knows that these two forms of reconciliation are actually indivisible in reality. His mandate for this task is found in passages like 2 Corinthians Chapter 5, verses 16-19. He is compelled to let the fact of this reconciliation, already accomplished by God in Jesus Christ, happen in his own life and relationships. However, in South Africa the law will not allow him to be such an agent of reconciliation. He is forced instead to abide by a humiliating system of separation that makes contact and the free interplay of human lives (in spite of racial differences) impossible. He is therefore in a serious dilemma; for to be an authentic servant of Jesus in his society faces him with two options — either disloyalty to Jesus because of the abandoning of his reconciling task, or possible civil disobedience because of fidelity to Jesus and his goal of reconciliation. We know that this is no imaginary dilemma.

At the recent U.C.M. conference for example, strong exception was taken to inter-racial fellowship by the Afrikaans newspapers. The expressions of reconciliation, humanity and friendship of those present was seriously distorted by the press and has led to the U.C.M. being investigated by the Prime Minister. Yet this was no more than a conference of genuine Christian reconciliation, born out of an interpretation of the gospel of Jesus which clearly differs from the ideological translation of the same gospel. Hence the dilemma. Do we stick with our interpretation or do we toe the ideological line? We have no doubt about the answer to that one, but the next question is

the tough one. How do we find faith to believe that fidelity to Jesus and his gospel is worth it — when it may cost us our security and freedom? What guarantee have we that such a possible crucifixion will be of any use in our situation? What right have we to ask for such a guarantee? It seems that all we have are the words of Jesus in Mark 8:34-38. Do we understand them correctly? Here we have the counsel of our fathers and brothers in the faith to guide us. *Our plea to them is: Speak to us honestly for God's*

sake, before we lose what is left of our integrity! Tell us whether trusting Jesus is enough and whether it has worked for you?

For the one thing we know is that the system of physical racial separation is immoral and unchristian. It is a front for self-interest and a lie that will never produce reconciliation in South Africa. We are therefore bound to expose and reject it as such — and then to obey his word, "go and be reconciled".

In doing this Christians will also have to decide whether to press for genuine partition as outlined, or alternately for an open democratic society with minority rights guaranteed.

1. Coertze, Language and van Eeden: Die Oplossing van die Naturelle-vraagstuk, p. 11, quoted by N. J. Rhoadie and H. J. Venter in Apartheid (HAUM, Pretoria, 1960), p. 22 f.
2. Hoernle Memorial lecture on the Transkei, 1967, U.C.T., Cape Town.
3. A Survey of Race Relations in South Africa, 1967, p. 15.

Prophetic Christianity in the Congo

— DR. MARIE-LOUISE MARTIN

3. The Kimbanguist Church and Politics

1. Political and economic situation of the Congo

When I left in mid-April for the Congo-Kinshasa, many friends here in the South asked me whether it was safe for a white person to go to the Congo in order to do research. Now, after having spent nearly three months in the Congo, I can say that it is perfectly safe. We know there had been serious political upheavals in the Congo and there were a number of reasons for them. The very treatment which the Kimbanguist Church had received from 1921 to 1959 at the hands of the Belgian Colonial Government alone could prove to what extent bitterness could have grown in circles outside the Christian Church where the message of forgiveness and reconciliation is not known and not put into practice. It is a miracle, a miracle of the grace of God, that the Kimbanguist Church never indulged in any xenophobia and never reverted to "Apartheid in reverse". Wherever we went, were it in the Lower Congo, in the Katanga, in the Kivu Province, in the Province Orientale where we stayed for several days in the half-destroyed city of Kisangani (formerly Stanleyville), we were in no way molested. On the contrary, people, Kimbanguists and non-Kimbanguists, showed us great friendliness when we once lost our way in Kinshasa or when we looked in vain for a certain office or shop in Kisangani or elsewhere. Those less friendly were unfortunately people of

my own European race who resented our staying with an African community. That there were even western missionaries among them, made me very sad indeed.

I got the impression of a country making tremendous strides forward, especially in the field of agriculture. This year, 1968, is the "year of agriculture"; every citizen is made responsible for the development of agriculture because it is the backbone of a country whose census shows that it has a population of at least 18 million. A new census may well reveal that there are many more. This was certainly the case with other African countries, where the latest census showed that the population was up to 40% more than one had expected it to be.

The State President himself has an experimental farm near Kinshasa, next door to Lutendele where the Kimbanguists have their Kibbutz. He tries out the best methods and encourages citizens to plant as much and as rationally as possible.

Furthermore, there are at present negotiations to establish industries, especially in the textile branch, because it is unreasonable to export cotton to Britain and to import woven and printed material at a high price. There is at least one factory in operation that produces very good and cheaper material than that imported from Britain or elsewhere.

All over the country storage centres for the local communities will be

established where they can sell their surplus products and from which they will be exported. The great problem is, however, transport as there is no railway to the Interior and the roads are partly in a very poor condition. Road-improvement will be one of the great undertakings in the near future. But even despite this the Congo-Kinshasa is already in a position to export.

The financial basis is sound since a monetary reform took place a year ago. The International Monetary Fund gave the Congo 18 months to achieve a reform. However this reform was achieved in only 12 months and today the Zaïre is one of the soundest monetary systems in Africa, apart from the South African Rand. This reform implied great sacrifices on the part of the Congolese people. Wages are low, and people still experience difficulties in making ends meet. Nevertheless the expanding agriculture helps with the result that malnutrition is being eliminated.

Furthermore there are prospects of more improvement in the near future. In his sensible and practical speech on TV which the State President General J. D. Mobutu gave on the eve of Independence Day (29th June 1968) he specifically insisted that every citizen is responsible for the economical progress of the country. He thanked all those who made sacrifices for it and took new and extremely strict measures against any form of corruption. Tourists are received with

friendliness and encouraged to come and enjoy the beauties of the country. Only those with a "mercenary" or "neo-colonialist" spirit who want to meddle in politics are kept out.

To what extent the Congolese State President is concerned with the welfare of the population as a whole was revealed to me at the end of my stay in the Congo. He set three days apart on which to receive delegations of the three main churches: the Roman Catholics, the Protestant Council in which 45 churches are more or less united, and the Kimbanguists. I had the privilege of attending his "dialogue" (as he called it) with the Kimbanguist delegation as an observer. He did not want circular talk, but straightforward speech. "You, the church leaders, are in contact with the people. You know what is not good in our country. You know the complaints", he said. "I am here to learn". The delegations were not afraid of telling him, a practising and very open-minded Roman Catholic, whatever complaints the people had to make. Immediately the secretaries had to take notes and he promised that he would give special attention to the matter. From what he said I concluded that he has great confidence in the spiritual head of the Kimbanguists, H. E. Mr. Joseph Diangienda, and in difficult matters he repeatedly asked him for his advice. He knows very well too that the Kimbanguists reject any kind of violence or war to settle conflicts between nations and tribes and individuals. He trusts them because they are, with their religious fervour and their practical Christianity, a tremendously uniting and reconstructing force in the whole country. They themselves have already the experience of re-unification yet this is one of the great problems in the Congo with which politicians have to grapple since the unfortunate secession of the Katanga.

The Congo is a one-party state and elections will take place in 1970 to re-establish the parliamentary system and to replace the present military regime. The party is called "mouvement populaire révolutionnaire", but "revolution" does not imply force but a peaceful evolution. The French word "révolutionnaire" has a much wider and less political meaning than the equivalent English term. In this one party all kinds of different opinions are tolerated but tribalism is not allowed. Through the school system the French language becomes

more and more a medium of communication in a country where over a hundred different languages and dialects are spoken.

2. The Basic statement on Church and Politics of the Kimbanguists

On April 7th, 1962, H. E. Mr. Joseph Diangienda published the following statement which I translate from the French text (and add some comments): "In its public declarations concerning its attitude to the authority of the state, the EJCSK (Eglise de Jesus Christ sur la terre par le prophète Simon Kimbangu) cannot and will not ignore the principles established by Christ himself when he said: 'Render to Caesar what is Caesar's and to God what is God's'. According to our understanding we have to make a distinction between spiritual and temporal authority (i.e. the church and the state). For this reason the EJCSK will never interfere directly in problems that must be examined and solved by the state. This will, however, not hinder us from drawing a line that indicates the attitude of our members because as citizens of the state they are confronted with problems of a temporal (i.e. secular, political) nature. This line that indicates the attitude which our members ought to take flows from the teaching and heritage of the founder of our church, the prophet Simon Kimbangu."

"The EJCSK is opposed to any ideology, doctrine or political, economic and social theory that denies the existence of God who is the source of life and thus of human progress. A faithful member of the EJCSK cannot agree to propagate or to adhere to an ideology, doctrine or theory upon which a political, economic or social system is built which tends to explain the historical evolution of mankind by denying divine intervention". This sentence shows clearly that the EJCSK is opposed to any Marxist theories.

"The members of the EJCSK are bound to fulfil their civil duties according to the laws of the country in which they reside". This is a point which the Kimbanguists emphasise, and though they reject violence, members of the Kimbanguist Church do their military service and on several occasions I saw soldiers coming to the spiritual head for advice and for his blessing.

"Knowing that the destiny of all the regions of the world is dependent

on co-operation and the acknowledgement of our mutual interdependence, the EJCSK condemns any policies which tend to restore in any country or region of the world political structures based on tribalism, regionalism or racialism, because the spirit of tribalism, regionalism or racialism does not only damage, but kills all efforts of bringing men together (rapprochement) as Christ has commanded it, and also opposes all economic and social progress which allows the full development of the human personality. The EJCSK thus condemns tribalism, regionalism and racialism. It desires the building up of a world in the spirit of a new humanism which fosters co-operation of all men whatever their race, tribal and ethnic affiliation may be, of whatever colour they are and to whatever social class they belong. Our anti-regionalist, anti-tribalist and anti-racialist attitudes do not imply, however, that we are opposed to the creation of politico-judicial units (or communities) which enable the grouping of people according to viable conditions because these people have the same ethnic affinities, similar traditions and the same culture. But these units must fit into a framework which allows to establish links between them so that they contribute to the full development of the people as a whole, first in a given country, then in a region of the world and finally on earth."

"As all men are created in the image of God, all men are bound to treat one another as brethren. The EJCSK considers the application of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights in all countries appropriate and necessary especially in relation to the fundamental liberties of men."

"The EJCSK prohibits its members from getting involved in controversies on denominational issues and believes that all Christian denominations are moving towards the same aim, namely to serve God in the interests of men. There is nothing that will hinder all religions whose foundation is the doctrine of Christ, from taking parallel roads to attain this aim". This statement is a proof of the truly ecumenical spirit that prevails among Kimbanguists.

"The EJCSK wishes that among citizens of all countries a sense of political and civil responsibility be developed with a view to bringing men closer to one another."

"The Church condemns the use of force in order to solve problems

which separate peoples." This statement is of utmost importance and has brought the EJCSK into serious difficulties in Kisangani. Kimbanguists refused first of all to side the "Simbas" i.e. the rebels and suffered as a consequence of it. When the Simbas were repelled, the Congolese army moved in and found the Kimbanguists praying under a structure of palm-leaves. Bombs were falling all around but the congregation simply persevered in prayer and nobody was hurt. Finally the army-commander came in and asked what book the pastor was holding in his hand. He gave him the Bible from which he had been preaching. Thereafter the commander told his soldiers that they should not molest these innocent people as they were not siding with either party. Nevertheless, a number of Kimbanguist hostages had been taken by the rebels and suffered beyond description at their hands.

We come now to the final statement of H. E. Mr. J. Diangienda, the spiritual head of the EJCSK: "The church has no desire to voice an opinion on political systems which a country ought to adopt. But it rejects any political system which deprives its citizens of the privilege of enjoying its fundamental human rights: the liberty of thought, of free expression, of religion and worship, the freedom of press and the voicing of one's opinion as well as the freedom of moving to any place."

3. A national Church

From independence in 1960 to this day, Simon Kimbangu has been hailed by politicians as "the first great African nationalist in the Congo". Now this is true in a very limited sense, since Simon Kimbangu had no nationalist tendencies. He was a man who had received the command to preach and heal in Christ's name and the movement he began is in the first instance religious. If from this religious movement a desire for national independence emerged, we can understand it very well in the light of the 40 years of persecution. But at no time did the Kimbanguist Church indulge in nationalistic propaganda and tendencies.

After Independence the offer was made to the EJCSK to become the "National Church of the Congo", but the leaders strongly disapproved and declined to be dependent on the state. They claimed rightly that the church

can only be the servant of Christ and must remain in a position to proclaim his message in season and out of season; it must be independent in such a way that it can raise its prophetic voice against any practice and ideology of the state of which it disapproves on the basis of the Gospel of Christ.

As a consequence Kimbanguist leaders such as Emmanuel Bamba broke away from the EJCSK and founded their own nationalistic Kimbanguist movement. This breakaway movement almost led to a catastrophe in 1966 when Bamba, then a minister in General Mobutu's cabinet, planned to assassinate the State President. The plan was discovered before he could put it into action and a military tribunal condemned him immediately to death. But as Bamba had claimed to be the true representative of Kimbanguism, the EJCSK was confused with Bamba's breakaway movement and enraged people began to burn down chapels and schools belonging to the real Kimbanguist Church. Fortunately for the EJCSK the error was discovered and Radio Congo repeated every few minutes that the EJCSK was completely innocent and that people should immediately stop molesting Kimbanguists and their property. Indeed God did have his protective hand over the EJCSK and this episode passed without having done harm to the church. On the contrary, the Congolese people realized that the EJCSK stood with its principle of non-violence.

This principle does, however, not mean non-involvement. The Kimbanguist Church is actively involved in the reconstruction of the Congo. Kimbanguists, as Christian individuals, take part in party-activities, in elections and other political spheres, but they know that they can do so only as Christians and that their Christian conviction must rule all their political actions and their words. This is a very sound restraint.

CONCLUSION

As a conclusion to these three articles on Kimbanguism I would like to suggest that this movement deserves our full attention and sympathy here in the South. We have over 2600 Independent African Churches in our own country but none of them could be compared in size and spiritual power to the Church of Christ on earth through the Prophet Simon

Kimbangu. They are split in too many groups. There are similar small splinter churches also in the Congo but they are of little concern compared with the truly evangelical and in no way syncretistic Kimbanguist Church. Its spiritual power and integrity stems certainly from the fact that Simon Kimbangu was not a man who had in any way "broken away" from an existing Church — this had never been his intention. He received quite simply a call from God, a call he found too great for him, and eventually accepted to obey. His short activity of a few months was followed by 30 years of martyrdom in a Lubumbashi prison and these years of suffering and faithfulness to Christ have released spiritual powers whose dimension we western Christians have somehow forgotten with our intellectual approach.

This Kimbanguist Church calls itself "Church of Christ on earth" and is stretching out its hands to Christian brethren all over the world. Is it not perhaps our duty to stretch our hands out to them since we share the same continent? They would like to learn from others, could we not learn a lot from them? One of the great lessons we can learn from them is their readiness to forgive in Christ's name and to be reconciled to their enemies even if these enemies are of a different tribe, language-group or race. In Christ we are one — this is true universalism, and yet we do not deny hereby our own cultural heritage. The Kimbanguists have kept it as far as it is in tune with the Christian message. They would be the last ones to deny any other group of men the same right, if only we remain **one**, united in Christ, sharing our concerns and our joys in a real practical way.

Finally, a last word: white mercenaries from South Africa have gone to the Congo to fight and harm people's lives. From the Kimbanguist Church in the Congo the message of peace and reconciliation comes to us. What should be our answer? Sympathy? But is there not more needed than feelings only? The Kimbanguists need help for their work of reconstruction; they need real friendship. Could our friendship and our true ecumenical spirit not also be expressed by some practical help? This would show them that we in the South worship and serve the same Lord Jesus Christ whom they praise and worship so fervently in words and deeds.

DIE KERK BUITE SUID-AFRIKA

— PROF. B. B. KEET

DIE GEREFORMEERDE KERK VAN NEDERLAND EN DIE GEREFORMEERDE EKUMENIESE SINODE

Dit sal seker nie van belang onthloot wees nie om te verneem wat die afgevaardigdes uit Nederland in 'n uitvoerige rapport oor die verhoudinge tussen die rasse ingedien het by die Geref. Ekumeniese Sinode wat in Augustus in Lunteren byeengekom het. (Ons ontnem die rapport aan Gereformeerd Weekblad). Dit sal ten minste ons laat verstaan waarom die Hollanders nie „hul mes vir ons in” gehad het nie, (soos soms verklaar word) „maar dat hulle veral besorgd was dat die Skrif tot sy reg sal kom.

Die rapporteurs het met die oog hierop 'n studiereis na Suid-Afrika onderneem. Hieraan het ook dr. C. J. Verplanke van die Christelik-Gereformeerde Kerk deelgeneem. As vrug van hul studie het hulle die volgende aanbeveling aan die Sinode gedoen:

1. Die geboorte van God aan die mens dat hy liefde moet openbaar en geregtigheid moet boeëfen, is geen teenstrydigheid, maar met mekaar ooreenstemmende norme vir sy individuele en gemeenskaplike handeling en sy toepassing op rasseverhoudinge.

2. Waaragtige naasteliefde vereis, dat ons ons naaste eer, ongeag sy ras of kultuur, as iemand wat geskape is na Gods beeld; dat ons hom in sy persoonlikheid respekteer as skepsel van God; en dat ons bereid is om ons in te lewe in sy posisie, om so te kan begryp hoe ons ons teenoor hom moet gedra in persoonlike en maatskaplike verhoudinge.

3. Die motief van selfbehoud, mits dit erken dat die mens beeldraer van God is, is 'n wettige antwoord op die tweede liefdesgebod en is nie slegs van toepassing op die mens se individuele handeling nie, maar ook op sy gemeenskapsverhoudinge en op die verhouding tussen die rasse.

4. Aangesien die mens eerder sy eie belange nastrewe as die welsyn van die medemens, behoort die kerk die nadruk te lê op die plig van die mens, sowel individueel as kollektief, om hom op te offer vir die welsyn van ander mense.

5. Via die juiste begrip van die regte, die gelykheid en die waardigheid van die mens, behoort ons alle mense te sien as skepsels van God, gemaak na sy beeld. Almal het gesondig, is rekskap verskuldig aan God en het die verlossing nodig. In ons verhouding tot medegelowiges moet ons die eenheid en gelykheid erken waarin alle Christene, ongeag hul ras, deel, danksy hul verlossing in Christus, en moet ons die verskille in taak, talente en verantwoordelikhede sowel tussen individue as rasse eerbiedig.

6. In sy woordverkondiging moet die kerk moedig en toepaslik spreek oor die aktuele maatskaplike en sedelike probleme, sowel tot opbou en vermaning as, indien nodig, tot toetsing van die werksaamhede en die beleid van owerhede en organisasies.

7. Dit is die taak van die kerk om riglyne aan te gee vir 'n Christelike etiek in die rasseverhoudinge, maar allereers die taak van die Christelike politieke groepe om dit toe te pas op die terrein van die burgerlike owerheid.

8. Die kerk dra 'n verantwoordelikhede jens, in kulturele opsig, onderontwikkelde volke waarmee hy in aanraking kom. By die uitoefening van sy taak behoort hy bewoë te word deur die liefde tot die naaste, en behoort daarna te strewen om die onderontwikkelde naaste tot volle Christelike groei te bring; alles langs die weg van oorreding en nie deur dwang nie.

9. In sy pastorale diens behoort die kerke begrip in rassevraagstukke te bevorder deur sy lede tot volle Christelike wasdom op die punt van rasseverhoudinge te bring. Dit moet geskied met 'n sterke drang, en met volharding, maar nie só dat onnodig aanstoot aan enige lid van die kerk gegee word nie.

10. In gehoorsaamheid aan die sendingopdrag van Christus moet die kerk die evangelie aan alle volke verkondig. Die beginsel van naasteliefde eis dat hierdie sendingarbeid die aard en kultuur van hulle wat die blye boodskap ontvang, eerbiedig vir sover dit deur Gods genade in stand gehou is, en die jong kerke so gou moontlik tot 'n eie kerkroering bring. Aan hierdie sendingarbeid behoort alle lede deel te neem.

11. Elke rassegroep moet die reg hê om tot volledige en onafhanklike ontwikkeling te kom, selfs as hy saamleef met ander rassegroepen in dieselfde land. Terwyl die wyse waarop so 'n ontwikkeling plaasvind van plek tot plek kan verskil, is dit 'n eis van die Christelike etiek dat alle groene die afsondering vermy en 'n verhouding van wedersydse behulpsaamheid bevorder.

12. Wanneer iemand verlang om saam met Christene van 'n ander ras op te gaan na die plek van aanbidding in 'n gemeenskap waar hy die geleentheid het om saam te aanbid met sy eie rasgenote, moet daar by hom aangedring word dat hy saamkom met die gemeente

waar hy die meeste kan bydra tot opbou van Gods volk en tot eie stigting.

13. Die eenheid van die kerk moet so spoedig en so volledig as die omstandighede en die kulturele ontwikkeling dit toelaat, tot uiting kom in gesamentlike viering van die eredienste, met inbegrip van die heilige Nagmaal deur Christene, ongeag hul ras.

14. Die Heilige Skrif spreek hom nie uit oor huwelike tussen persone van verskillende rasse nie. Kerk en Staat behoort hulle daarvan te onthou om sowel sulke huwelike te verbied as blindelings te bevorder; die huwelik is immers enersyds in wese 'n familie-aangeleentheid, terwyl andersyds kinders wat gebore is uit die egvereniging van persone van verskillende ras die maatskaplike en kulturele aansluiting by albei rasse waaruit hulle kom, kan mis.

Teen hierdie bogaande gedagtes sal 'n mens geen noemenswaardige beswaar kan aanteken nie. Tog het prof. Van den Berg by die Sinode die volgende „kanttekeninge” ingedien. Ek token 'n paar daarvan aan:-

Hy vrees dat die ondersheid in die Skepping in die rapport 'n te sterk aksent gekry het. In die leer van die Skepping is ook met betrekking tot rasseverhoudinge die eenheid van die menslike gesag fundamenteel. In die gevalle wêreld het daar rasseverskille ontstaan, maar daaraan moet geen te swaar teologiese gewig geheg word nie. Ook nie biologies en kultureel nie. Hand. 17:26 sê wel dat die proses van die geskiedenis nie buite Gods leiding omgaan nie, maar dit wil nie sê dat alle verskeidenhede van volke en rasse soos dit nou bestaan, moet beskou word as deur God gewil nie. Nog minder dat ons daaraan etiese norme mag ontleen nie.

Terwyl die offisiële rapport in baie opsigte nogal negatief staan teenoor die strewen na gelykheid, wat vandag so sterk op die voorgrond tree, merk prof. Van den Berg hierby op: Hoewel teenoor God geen mens regte kan laat geld nie, is daar wel onvervreembare regte van die een mens teenoor die ander. Die kerk moet met skaamte erken dat sommige regte van die mens eerder buite as binne die kerk erken word (vgl. die strewen na sosiale geregtigheid in die 19e eeu.)

Ten opsigte van die reg van selfbehoud ook as groep of nasie: dit

is Bybels gewettig, maar alleen wanneer dit gepaard gaan en so nodig beperk word deur die Bybelse eise van liefde en geregtigheid, nie wanneer dié selfbehoud nagestreef word ten koste van geregverdigde verlangens van ander groepe na normale intermenslike kontak en gemeenskap nie. Dit kan ook wees dat 'n mens uiteindelik „homself” die beste „behou” deur bepaalde voorregte prys te gee en daardeur nuwe relasies skep met mense van 'n ander kultuur en ras.

Die rapport sê dat die mens die volste reg het om hom te verset teen pressie van buite af om hom massaal te integreer. Hierop merk prof. Van den Berg op: Dit is nie duidelik

wat bedoel word deur „pressie van buite” en met „massale integrasie” nie. 'n Gemeenskaplike erediens kan 'n teken wees wat positief waardeer moet word as 'n teken van die deur God gegewe eenheid van die kerk, dat die eenheid van die kerk só gedemonstreer word (ook 'n beswaar van die Suid-Afrikaanse kerke). Wat kan daarteen wees? Die eenheid van die liggaam van Christus moet sigbaar wees voor die forum van die wêreld (Joh. 17:12).

Eindelik, as die rapport sê dat elke groep die reg moet hê om binne sy eie grense tot volledige en onafhanklike ontwikkeling te kom, teken prof. Van den Berg aan: So 'n onafhanklikheid as verskillende rasse saam op

één grondgebied lewe, is onmoontlik. Niemand mag gedwing en niemand mag belemmer word om menslike kontak te hê met medemense wat nie alleen dieselfde land, maar ook dieselfde geloof het nie. Dit sou 'n goeie ding wees as die kerke 'n ontmoetingsplek van verskillende rasse daarstel. En waar die stryd om 'n eie kultuur te bekom, bitterheid en vervreemding dreig te veroorsaak, het die kerk die taak van versoening. Dit kan hy doen op verskillende maniere: een daarvan is dat hy duidelik laat sien dat rasseverskille slegs 'n ondergeskikte betekenis het in die lig van die komende Koninkryk, waarin alle dinge nuut gemaak sal wees.

Christian-National Education, the Conscience Clause and the Church

— DAVID PERK

Group identity grows and expands with history. Its image plays an important part in the formation of the self-meaning, self-identification and sense of belonging of its members. It exposes them however to group forces that, in periods of super-heated nationalism, violate their individual ego boundaries and rob them of objectivity and self-direction. They are likely to find themselves at such time little able to resist the extremist influences that exploit the image group identity for political, personal or purely emotional ends.

Rationally regarded, the Afrikaner should by now have persuaded himself, as he has the rest of the world, that his identity is irrepressible. To have survived the tendentious legislation, blandishments and the social pressures of the English presence through several centuries and have come out on top is proof enough. And yet, at this time, when he should feel able to meet the world of peoples on equal terms, learn from them and make his contribution of intellectual and spiritual experience to them, he is adjured by many of his leaders to stand on guard over his identity and not permit its contamination by close association with others of different speech, views and persuasions, in any and all fields.

PHOBIA OF CONTAMINATION

The insecurity of centuries is understandably not easily allayed, but if anything is going to foment it, it is the phobia of contamination. A phobia bespeaks insecurity, and whilst it purposes to dispel it, in fact sustains it. The phobia, unhap-

pily, is reinforced by the exclusive and narrow Christian-National bias (narrow in its exclusively Afrikaner interpretation of both Christian and National) which nationalist-Afrikaner leadership is seeking to give to its group identity.

However instinctual and natural it is to seek to preserve and protect a group's identity, it cannot be achieved by confining its image to the past. To reject newer influences and experiences because they challenge and threaten to extend the confines of the image is like the response of the ostrich that proverbially buries its head in the sand, not to see oncoming danger. If group identity cannot withstand the pressures of a challenging environment it will certainly not survive insulation from them by the group's withdrawal into a laager.

It is not without reason that a considerable section of the Afrikaner people refuses to accept the reality of facts and numbers that confront it. The Afrikaner people are outnumbered within the geographical boundaries of the country that they must

share with others, and their policy of exclusiveness is morally opposed outside them. Nor will they look the future, with its frightening possibilities, in the face. Instead they turn their backs on it and stand spellbound by the past.

The self-defensive exclusiveness, that makes everyone appear an outsider, will neither win them friends and allies nor strengthen their identity. On the contrary, it could, sooner or later, alienate the non-Afrika-

CATASTROPHIC

Even more catastrophic will be its effect on the Afrikaner himself. The image of herrenvolk generated by exclusiveness contradicts the humility that characterized their God-fearing forebears and can only aggravate the antagonisms provoked by the exclusiveness.

The introduction of the Christian-National bias in the educational system at school-level would have the unfortunate effect of reinforcing the separateness of the language groups established by the principle of separate schools for the two groups. It would do even more harm to the education and unity of South Africa's white population, if such a bias were to result from a widespread omission of the conscience clause from the con-

stitutions of South African universities.

By the time a student reaches university his ideas on religion and Afrikaner identity have already crystallized. To give a Christian-National character to a university can hardly add to them in a positive manner. On the contrary, at a time when young people become aware of the wider horizons in which the individual and community operate and are moved to re-evaluate their beliefs and attitudes, to be denied the freedom to review values and reorganize themselves afresh, under pain of being considered heretics and betrayers of Afrikanerdom, could boomerang in the rejection of the restrictive philosophy and policy that prohibits knowledge of ideas that challenge or contradict it.

Freedom of thought and speech is denied young men and women at the cost of their maturation. Where there has been repression of aggressive responses to the authoritative father-figure in childhood the adult may continue to submit to the regime of restriction and prohibition and become a sycophantic extremist. He may, on the other hand, become emancipated from the vetoes established in his childhood, and in his newly-won freedom rebel against such a regime, rejecting the good with the bad in it. A policy intended to save a generation from progressive ideas and to win their unswerving loyalty and dedication to a past identity is likely to backfire and produce the very results it was seeking to prevent. Youth has the curiosity and compulsion to examine knowledge and only in the exercise of this in-

herent right will it learn to appreciate the meaning and value of its spiritual heritage.

A university should not be like a stagnant pool, never renewed with fresh water. Rather it should be a meeting place of enquiring minds, burgeoning ideas, recurrent expeditions into the unexplored (for the student) areas of the intellect and the spirit.

At university the student should be given the opportunity and encouragement to meet men and women of other persuasions and outlooks. It would thus prepare him for the challenges he will meet after leaving university and for the larger world in which he will have to find his proper place. Without such preparation he will continue the isolationist estrangement from people and ideas, to which a narrow university life conditioned him.

The absence of religious tolerance at a university is likely to discourage not a few suitable teachers from seeking appointments there, with the consequence that it will not be able to enlist the best lecturing talent available. The student will thus be deprived of the lack of opportunity for free dialogue and of superior teaching talent.

It is inconceivable that a university lecturer would attempt to influence students away from their religious beliefs and to deflect them from their church affiliations. If a lecturer should express progressive ideas, that is to say, ideas that reflect a different, larger or more universal outlook, the student has the opportunity of confronting and discussing them in an atmosphere of cultural objectivity. A

university should provide a forum for the unfettered debate of different views and ideas, so that a student may learn to correct his prejudices and acquire fresh values.

CHURCH AND STATE

The Christian faith, worship and ethic has been an outstanding feature of the Afrikaner way of life and identity in the past, but if the state is to use this expression of the Afrikaner spirit to support and reinforce an extreme brand of political Afrikanerdom, as it is seeking to do with Christian-National education and the exclusion of the conscience clause from university constitutions, it will alienate all those, amongst their own people and others, who will surely see in these manoeuvres the collusion of church and state to bring about narrow political ends.

If the church and state are to support each other in a policy of excluding other creeds and racial groups from the South African policy, they stand the risk of enlaagering a considerable section of South Africa's population, aloof from the rest of it and out of touch with the larger world beyond.

South Africa faces the gigantic problem of uniting its diverse races, creeds and colours in a common loyalty, without which its present peace and prosperity will sooner or later be threatened by the disharmonies that inhere in the present social structure of South Africa. If the church is to play its proper role, it should seek to embrace all the diverse elements in the understanding, unity and universalism that express the spirit of religion.

GOD SOUGHT

If God made all church buildings disappear, what would be left of many churches?

What if next Easter morning every clergyman was greeted at the place where his church had stood, by an angel who said "God has removed all buildings dedicated to Him. He is not to be found in buildings made with hands. He has risen and is gone before you in the world. Go and reveal Him to your people".

Where would the clergy start to find Him? Would they start prayer meetings in homes as a substitute for church services? Would this reveal God more?

Where is the best evidence of God's presence? Where around us can we point and say, "THERE is evidence of God's grace moving in the world?"

Would the disappearance of all church buildings be a tragedy of the

first order — a second driving forth from the garden of Eden? Or would it be a blessing — the breaking of the invisible prison which separates the living church from the world?

Are the many dwindling congregations a sign that God has indeed 'removed the building' as the central meeting place between Himself and man?

ROSEMARY E. ELLIOT

Op U Hebben Onze Vaders Vertrouwd

(Opskrif op die hoeksteen van die ou Hugenoten-Gedenkteken, Koningin Victoriastreet, Kaapstad, waar die Sinode van die Kaapse Kerk in 1961 byeen was.)

Toe die Cottesloe-rapport tydens die sitting van die Kaapse Sinode in 1961 bespreek is, het een van die afgevaardigdes (aan die groen tafel) gewaarsku dat, as die aanbevelings van Cottesloe deur die Sinode aanvaar sou word, dit die regering in verleentheid sou bring. 'n Lidmaat van die Kaapse Kerk is daardeur tot hierdie gediggie geïnspireer. Om dit beter te verstaan, moet die aanhaling uit die Dagboek van Adam Tas daarby gelees word. Ons plaas dit omdat dit sedert 1961 nie minder nie maar steeds meer toepaslik geword het . . .

Der Hugenoten nagedachtenis gewijd
en hun geloofs- en vrijheidstrijd,
staat de Synode-Zaal, op hechte fundamente opgebouwd:
„Op U hebbe onze vaders vertrouwd.”

Men zat.

Toen sprak er een: „Hoort, broeders, gij moet weten,
een al te stout gesproken woord wordt ons allicht verweten
door hen, die op de hoge kussens zijn gezeten!

Wie heeft, als zij, de natie opgebouwd?

Wien is de toekomst beter toevertrouwd?

Vorst er eens na, en kijkt, of ooit de vorstelijke deuren
voor ons gesloten waren. Zoudt gij dat nu verbeuren
door steeds maar over *conscientie* en *getuigenis* te zeuren?

Vraagt naar hun oordeel! Spreekt niet houd!

Dat is de weg tot *zelvebehoud*!”

Hij zweeg; en heel d'arena werd in duisternis geloken
door zwartgerokte armen, schier eenstemmig opgestoken
(schoon velen niet-en-wisten, waarover was gesproken).

Toen zag ik in de duisternis bedroefde schimmen gaan:

'k Zag dominee Pierre Simond en Ouderling Villiers,
en d'oude Guiliam du Toit, die tegen Willem Adriaan
van *conscientie* sprak, en dapper dorst te staan.

. . . Zij gingen droevig daar vandaan.

Hervormingsdag 1961
A. H.

Dagboek van Adam Tas,

18 Februarie 1706.

„Desen avond reeds te kooij zijnde
wierde aan onse deur geklopt, de-
zelfde geopent zijnde was er Mr. van
der Bijl en Pretorius voor, binnen
gekomen zijnde, wierde mij een brief
vertoont van Mr. van der Heijden,
die Van der Bijl en mij scrijft als
dat Guiliam du Toit op gisteren bij
den gouverneur was geweest, die
hem aanstonds in een kamer alleen
hadden geroepen, daar hem van den
gouverneur was afgevraagd, of hij
mede zijn hand hadde geteekend,
toen er over hem geschreeven was,
waarop Mons. du Toit hem volmondig
op antwoorde: Ja ik mijn heer,
toen vraagde de gouverneur, wie
heeft u daartoe gedwongen? Du Toit

gaf tot antwoord: *Mijn conscientie
mijnheer*, hierbij voegende, ik heb
deesen morgen een legger wijn bij
de generaale pagter gebragt, die
volgens koop nog 13 leggers moest
ontfangen, maar in plaats van wijn
te ontfangen, heeft hij mij uijtge-
scholden slimmer als of ik een gauw-
dief was. De gouverneur zeijde ver-
der, waarom hebt ge mij niet ge-
waarschouwd als het u niet wel en
ging, eer dat ge over mij quam
schrijven, ik zoude u dan wel te
regt geholpen hebben. Du Toit ant-
woorde, 't soude dan soo veel ge-
weest hebben als nu, *en of ik al ge-
holpen was, zoo was de heele ge-
meente nog niet geholpen*, ik ben een
oud man, mijn brood zal haast ge-
bakken zijn, 't schrijven dat ik ge-

daan hebbe is uijt liefde voor de ge-
meente geschied. Den gouverneur
was over dit rondborstig seggen ver-
baast, en seijde hierop tegens hem,
heb ik u niet een stuk land gegee-
ven? Du Toit antwoorde: Ja mijn
heer, die drooge post over de
Berg rivier. Daar op zeijde den gou-
verneur weder: Du Toit ik heb sulx
aan u niet verdient, en dat wel tot
drie maal toe, en ik had dit van u
niet verwagt, ik hoop God zal bij
u doen als ghij bij mij gedaan hebt,
waarop du Toit antwoorde, ik hoop
zo mijn heer. Hier op zijn ze van
malkanderen geschijden. Du Toit
heeft hier in getoont dat hij een
eerlijk man is, en 't was te wenschen
datter wat veel sulke patriotten waar-
en.”

(Engelse vertaling).

"This evening, we being already in bed, there came a knock upon our door, the which being opened there stood without Mr. van der Bijl and Mr. Pretorius, who being come within, there was showed me a letter from Mr. van der Heijden, the which do write to Mr. van der Bijl and me how that yesterday Guiliam du Toit had been to the Governor, that did straightway call him singly into a chamber, and did there demand of him if he had set his hand with the rest, when the paper concerning him was made out, to the which Mr. du Toit did answer flatly, Yes, sir, I did. Then the Governor questioned him, Who did constrain you unto this? Du Toit returned

answer: My conscience, sir; adding thereto, I did this morning carry a leaguer of wine to the contractor general, that by the bargain do have 13 leaguers still to take of me, yet would he not receive my wine, but railed upon me worse than I had been a thief. Then said the Governor, Why did you not advise me, if it fared not well with you, before you come to write concerning me, for so I should surely have holpen you aright. Du Toit answered, Then had it been the same as it now is, and albeit I myself were presently relieved, not so for that the whole community. I am an old man, and my day will soon be done; so I have written anything, it hath been for love of my people. At which round manner of

speech the Governor was amazed, and with that did say to him, Did I not give you a slice of land? Du Toit made answer, Yes, sir, that dry station across the Berg River. Thereupon the Governor said again, Du Toit, I have not deserved this of you (repeating the same three times), nor had I looked for this from you. I hope that God will deal with you as you have dealt with me; to the which Du Toit replied, I hope so, sir; and with that they did part, the one from the other. Herein hath Du Toit witnessed that he is an honest man; it were to be wished there was patriots a many like him."

(Translation by prof. A. C. Paterson. 1914).

Letters — Briewe

REPLY TO MR. COOKS

The Rev. Edmund Hill O.P., St. Nicholas Priory, Stellenbosch.

I have been asked to comment on Mr. V. J. Cooks' letter (Pro Veritate, 15th August). I wonder how far comment is necessary in your columns. I imagine that the supporters of apartheid as a Christian policy will find Mr. Cooks' arguments in their favour far more embarrassing than you will. Perhaps you should ask Dr. Vorster or Dr. Treurnicht to comment.

Still, here is my comment for what it is worth. Mr. Cooks fails to make the elementary distinction between data and the interpretation of data; one of his ecumenical references is also a little haywire. He writes 'For in the days of Noah the descendants of Adam the Son of God (chap. 3:38) entertained the segregated descendants of Cain'. I do not know what chap. 3:38 refers to, but I take it that the biblical reference he has in mind is Gen. 6:1-8. There we are told 'that the sons of God saw the daughters of men were fair'; but to call the sons of God Adamic (I presume he means descendants of Seth; even Cain, after all, was a son of Adam) and the daughters of men Cainite, is pure guesswork. Later on he goes even further with his guesswork when he calls the Adamic race white and the Cainite race black. There are no biblical data whatever to support this fantasy.

If Mr. Cooks is a fundamentalist in his approach to Scripture, then he ought to leave Cain out of his argument, as all Cain's descendants, on a fundamentalist literal interpretation, were wiped out

by the flood. He would be better advised to look for the ancestor of the black race in Ham, one of Noah's sons. I believe that is the traditional apologetic for apartheid.

If, however, he is not a fundamentalist, then perhaps it is worth pointing out to him that Cain (Qain in the Hebrew) appears to be the eponymous ancestor of the Kenites (Hebrew Qeniim). Now this was a tribe which was very closely associated with Israel. Moses' father-in-law is called a Kenite, Judges 1:16. Other references to them can be found in Judges 4, Num. 24:21, I Sam. 15:6, I Chron. 2:55. So if they were a black race — though none of these references suggest they were — they were not segregated by the Israelites. Incidentally, quite apart from these Kenites, into whose tribe Moses married, Moses did also marry a black wife, a Cushite (i.e. Ethiopian) woman, Num. 12:1. His brother and sister, Aaron and Miriam strongly disapproved — and God punished Miriam for her racialism by striking her with leprosy and making her white indeed!

But in any case, it is hard to see what any of this has to do with the gospel of Jesus Christ, which is to be preached, for the remission of sins, to all nations under heaven. I cannot follow Mr. Cooks' argument by which he appears to make Elijah the connecting link, and so I cannot comment on it.

WARNINGS IGNORED

Worried Christian, Cape Town.

According to a columnist in today's Cape Times (31st August), the Rev. D. P. Botha, who represented the N. G. Sending Kerk at the Reformed Ecumenical Synod at Lunteren, Holland, said, in an interview with 'Die Burger', that the criticism of South Africa, on theological

grounds, was the fiercest ever encountered. He suggested that "Discussions will have to be held in South Africa about the necessity of some discriminatory measures for the successful execution of the policy of separate development. Consultation between White and non-White in the church field is an urgent necessity in the Republic."

The columnist, Gerald Shaw, comments: "It is sad to think that something rather similar was said eight years ago, after Sharpeville and Langa, by the men of Cottesloe; and that discriminatory measures have subsequently multiplied apace."

One also recalls Mr. Justice Snyman's stern warning after he had investigated the causes of the Paarl riots in 1960. These were also ignored. As were also the warning of the Cape Synod of the N.G.K. that the diabolical migratory labour laws were a 'cancer' in our system. When the day of retribution eventually dawns for our present government, as it inevitably must, they will not be able to say that they were not warned. But they WILL be able to realise that they were too stubborn and arrogant to heed the warnings.

ANTWOORD OP VRAE OOR ROOMS-KATOLIEKE KERK

Mnr. J. A. Duigan, Privaatsak 175, Pretoria.

In die Augustus-uitgawe van *Pro Veritate* is ds. Van Loggerenberg weer aan die woord teen die Roomse. Ek weet dat hy nie bereid is om die waarheid oor my kerk te aanvaar nie, maar ek sal probeer om op sy besware te antwoord. Ek beskik oor die feite, maar die ruimte ontbreek.

Ds. Van Loggerenberg begin deur te verklaar dat die Rooms-Katolieke Kerk deur sy volhardende afgodery en pouslike hoogkerklike glorie Jesus Christus

in die hemel en op aarde verdring en dat die kerk se mistisistiese verering van Maria die alleenheerskappy van Christus in die hemel verklein. Dan gaan hy voort teen die deur die eeue wêreldberoemde teoloog Thomas van Aquino wie se teologie nie met dié van ds. Van Loggerenberg ooreenkom nie: dus is Thomas verkeerd!

Ds. Van Loggerenberg is dankbaar dat ek in my onlangse brief na II Petrus 1:20 en Gal. 1:8 verwys, maar in hierdie stadium wil ek sy dankbaarheid toets. Hy aanvaar dat dié tekste die onfeilbare Woord van God is. Petrus waarsku teen „eie uitlegging” en Paulus waarsku teen ’n „ander evangelie”. Lees nou wat daar in tekste soos Titus 2:13-15, Matt. 16:27 en Jak. 2:24 staan oor die betekenis van „goeie werke”. Hierdie tekste (en daar is meer!) is die Woord van God. Maar wat sê Martin Luther? Hy sê dat geloof sonder die werke genoeg is. Wie is nou reg, die apostels van Jesus Christus of Luther met sy eie uitlegging?

Nou kom ons by ds. Van Loggerenberg se vier vrae oor die Rooms-Katolieke Kerk.

1. Oor Maria-aanbidding. Ek antwoord: Ons Rooms-Katolieke roep Maria aan maar aanbidding in die sin van die Engelse woord „adoration” word streng verbied en is ’n ontoelaatbare sonde. Calvin en Luther het ook met die hoogste verering van Maria gepraat. Is dit verkeerd vir Rooms-Katolieke maar reg vir Calviniste?

2. Die Bybel-bewyse vir die onfeilbaarheidsleer. Sien Matt. 16:18-19, Luk. 22:31-32, Joh. 21:15-17. Weet ds. Van Loggerenberg e.a. dat onfeilbaarheid baie selde deur pouse gebruik is? Ensikliek-briewe is bv. nie onfeilbaar nie. Petrus het nooit iets vir homself toegeëien nie. Jesus Christus het Petrus verkies.

3. „Valse” Roomse tradisie. Lees II Thes. 2:15 en II Tim. 2:2.

4. Die Bybel-gronde vir Maria as mede-Verlosseres en haar vergoddeliking. Daar is geen Bybel-gronde nie en dit is ’n groot sonde („mortal sin”) om Maria goddelik te noem. Jesus Christus is natuurlik die Hoogste Verlosser, maar Maria as Moeder van Christus en mede-Verlosseres kan baie vir ons doen, net soos sy vir die jong getroude paar te Kana in Galiléa gedoen het. Lees ook Luk. 1:46-49: „... want kyk, van nou af sal al die geslagte my salig noem. Want Hy wat magtig is het groot dinge aan my gedoen, en heilig is sy Naam”.

Ons Rooms-Katolieke weet dat Alfonso van Liguori in die oordrywende Italiaanse styl oor Maria geskryf het, maar hy het ook geskryf: „Ons erken dat God die enige oorsprong van ons welsyn is en dat Maria maar net ’n skepsel is: *al wat sy ontvang het, is deur die genade van God*”.

CHRISTIAN UNITY AND PRIVATE JUDGMENT

Mr. V. G. Davies, 89 Kloof Road, Sea Point, Cape Town.

I found the article entitled “Prophetic Christianity in the Congo” (August issue) most depressing. What hope is there for visible Christian unity if individuals are going to continue to claim the right, and the calling, to set up new “Churches” and thus increase still further the already lamentable number of divisions within Christendom? The Christian unity for which our Lord prayed to His heavenly Father — a unity based on divinely revealed truth — cannot be achieved as long as the principle of private judgment holds sway. Human nature being what it is, fallen and wayward, cannot rely on private judgment as a means of attaining to revealed truth, and it is precisely for this reason that Christ has established on earth an Apostolic teaching authority (magisterium) as the one certain way of conveying Christian truth to all generations of mankind. If so-called prophets such as Simon Kimbangu are prompted and guided by the Holy Spirit, then it means that the Holy Spirit is working, not for Christian unity, but for increasing Christian division! Such a conclusion however, is absurd.

Clearly the Holy Spirit is not prompting and guiding Simon Kimbangu and his like — they may be sincere, but obviously they are woefully misguided.

PROPHETIC CHRISTIANITY IN THE CONGO

by Dr. Marie-Louise Martin

(with two supplements on “Documents of the Kimbanguist Church” and “Special Considerations for Missiology and African Church History”) will shortly be available in a brochure form. The price will be announced in our next issue.

Order from The Christian Institute of Southern Africa,
P.O. Box 31134,
Braamfontein,
Johannesburg.

