

COLOUR AND THE SOUTH AFRICAN CHURCH

C. W. M. GELL

Ex-Editor of "Africa X-Ray Report"

Two articles, which I wrote in 1954 about the controversy of Canon Collins with the South African Church, were refused publication because editors thought they would offend white readers. And this, on the mundane commercial level at which the attitude of editors is possibly excusable, is precisely the temptation to which the Church in South Africa is succumbing: the fear that, if it acts vigorously against the colour bar within and outside the Church, it will lose the allegiance of its white members.

"The Church", as an African Anglican priest told Canon Collins, "is riddled with the colour bar." This takes three main forms: differentiation of stipends as between white and non-white clergy, systems of election to governing councils of the churches which are designed to preserve white control, and separate churches or services for whites and non-whites. The first of these is a rather technical and tedious matter which I shall have to omit here. The third I shall return to. The second reveals certain basic self-deceptions commonly (and often unconsciously) practised by white South African Christians.

At this stage we must necessarily speak of the Churches, not the Church. Christ is indeed divided in South Africa: Church from Church and white from black. What has to be said here about Church organisation does not apply to the Roman Catholics, whose system is not based on election, or to the Dutch Reformed Churches (D.R.C.) whose non-white adherents do not participate in Church control. All the other main Churches regulate part of their affairs through elected parish councils, diocesan synods, provincial or episcopal synods—or their presbyteries, assemblies, circuits, etc., in the non-Anglican communions.

For the sake of brevity and clarity, because also it is the Church to which I belong, I will deal chiefly with the Anglican system. What has to be said is applicable with minor modifications to the other Churches. Bishop Ambrose Reeves of Johannesburg told an American audience that "Europeans and Africans sit in my synod with equal voting rights". Canon Collins with equal truth said:

"The Church sees to it that there is no chance for the African to outvote the white man".¹

For delegates are elected to synod by a system that ensures continued white control. The details vary slightly from diocese to diocese. But in the neighbouring diocese of Pretoria it works like this. In every European parish, one delegate may be elected for every 12 communicants, two for every 75, three for every 150, and a maximum of four for every 300 and upwards. For Africans, one delegate may be elected for every mission district, two if there are 400 or more communicants, and a maximum of three if there are 1,000 or more communicants. The diocese of Johannesburg has proportionately more white members of the Church than most. But under a similar system of election its 17,196 white communicants (29 per cent.) elect 58 per cent. of the delegates to synod and the 40,850 black communicants (71 per cent.) elect only 42 per cent. However equal their voting rights once there in synod, and whatever the reasons may be for this state of affairs, it is, in fact, a "packed house". And it is impossible to accept the usual argument that the reason is financial not racial—the whites contributing the greater proportion of Church funds and therefore "deservedly" retaining control—unless it can be shown (as it cannot) that there is similar discrimination in England between rich and poor parishes.

In some of the Free Churches the method is rather different but the result much the same. Where, as in the Presbyterian Church, representation to presbyteries is by congregations (equally represented), African communities are either too small (and therefore financially unstable) to rise from mission stations to full status as congregations, and thus do not qualify for representation; or achieve financial self-sufficiency and status by having far greater numbers than most European congregations, yet only receive the one delegate allotted to each congregation. Where, in the Anglican case, the system of loaded representation seems to have been a deliberate departure from the English norm, the Presbyterian and others have achieved loaded representation by transplanting their democratic systems direct from the motherland to a country where the class and racial divisions so largely coincide, where the economic colour bar makes it doubly difficult for the poorer congregations to raise even the lower stipends paid to their African clergy. The

¹. There are three dioceses in South Africa—Zululand, Basutoland and St. John's—where the African vote is in the preponderance and decisive. These three dioceses consist of almost exclusively African territories in which the white minority is so infinitesimal that it would be virtually impossible to devise a voting system leaving whites in control.

non-white membership of all Churches, except the D.R.C., greatly exceeds their white membership. Yet all are white-controlled.

"Is Christ divided?" asked St. Paul. The affirmative answer is all too obvious when one looks at worship in South Africa. The D.R.C., of course, has erected separate worship into a virtue and there have been periodical attempts to justify it on scriptural grounds. The fundamental precept of the old Boer republics, "No equality in Church or State," held firm in the ecclesiastical sphere as in the secular. Over 53 per cent. of the white population are members of the three D.R.Churches, nearly 1,500,000 people. But these Churches also include over half a million non-whites, roughly half Cape coloured and half African, organised in separate congregations under a separately controlled Mission Church². And the stresses and strains to which the allegiance of these non-whites in the D.R.C. Mission Church is subjected as the repressive aspects of apartheid are applied with increasing vigour in order to subordinate non-whites in the "white areas" (88 per cent. of the country)—together with the isolation in which the D.R.C. found itself at the World Council of Churches at Evanston in 1954—account for the birth (it is no more yet) of a new defensive attitude among some of the intelligentsia of the D.R.C. and, certainly, among those closely in contact with its mission work. It could hardly be otherwise with Churches which have admitted (through the mouth of the Rev. C. B. Brink, the most influential D.R.C. leader today) being "in a special sense responsible for much that is done and said today in regard to non-European affairs"³. Thus, as non-white revulsion from the oppressive features of apartheid spills over into unrest within the D.R.C. Mission Church and even disaffection and breakaways, that Church is forced to search its heart. In its latest authoritative pronouncement the Federal Council of the D.R.C. has declared that it

². The white population divides (1951 census):—

D.R.C.	53 per cent.	1,402,703 persons
Anglican	15·8 per cent.	416,472 persons
Methodist	8·3 per cent.	219,021 persons
Roman Catholics	5·3 per cent.	141,330 persons
Presbyterian	3·8 per cent.	100,739 persons

Congregational, Lutherans, Baptists, Christian Scientists, Salvation Army, Seventh Day Adventists, Spiritualists and Jews account for most of the rest.

For non-whites the latest available figures are for the 1946 census, which show the three largest non-white communions to be:—

Methodists	1,094,254	(Africans 1,002,955)
Anglicans	741,192	(Africans 552,633)
Ned. Geref. Kerk	533,633	(Africans 248,771)

The recently published Tomlinson Report gives the following percentages of total Church

“will work for a closer community of the faithful of all race groups”. It maintains its absolute prohibition on “the danger of the mixture of the white and non-white races”, insists that there is as yet no demand for “a change in the existence of separate Churches for white and non-white”. But it shows by its very mention of the subject at all that some of its leaders are becoming aware of a serious defect in its Christian witness.⁴ However, these are still but straws in the wind.

The general position in regard to mixed worship in the other Churches is seen in the contrast between the quite unequivocal declaration of the Episcopal Synod of the Anglican Church (repeated many times earlier and later by leading priests and prelates) that there is no colour bar, and the plain unpalatable fact that whites and blacks very seldom worship together. Here again, I will speak chiefly of my own Anglican Church; but it is roughly representative. There *are* Anglican parishes which practise mixed worship, though they are a tiny proportion of the whole number. There are rather more which permit separate services for non-whites in their church building at times when it is not required for whites. But there are many more—probably the great majority—which neither worship together nor provide separate services because they do not believe there is any demand for either; because non-whites do not come to their theoretically open services (and, therefore, the question of excluding them or making separate provision has not arisen), and it is thought that they are adequately catered for in their separate churches in the location (African township) or elsewhere. Finally, there are some parishes in which the issue has been raised, in which the recalcitrance of the white

membership to total South African population:—

D.R.C. . . .	15.4 per cent.	Roman Catholics	4.8 per cent.
Methodists . . .	11.2 per cent.	Lutherans . . .	4.1 per cent.
Anglicans . . .	9.8 per cent.	Presbyterians . . .	2.3 per cent.
Bantu Separatist Churches	6.7 per cent.	Apostolic Faith Mission	2.2 per cent.
		Congregationalists	2.0 per cent.

³. Mr. Brink, who was a fellow-student with Dr. H. F. Verwoerd at Stellenbosch University, is on “Bert” and “Henk” terms with the powerful Minister of Native Affairs, leading architect of Nationalist apartheid; and has said that he often consults with him.

⁴. The statement said *inter alia*: “It is also our calling . . . to trust expectantly that in this country, too, the Gospel of Jesus Christ will gradually bring about the execution of the command and ideal of the Master with regard to the unity of his people”. It then referred to the dispersion through sin and selfishness of the “one great human family” into different and hostile nations. “In spite of the incarnation of the Lord this disruption and conflict between peoples and nations outside Christ will last to the end of time.”

It must be explained that for Afrikaner Nationalists, and the D.R.C. seems sometimes to share this view, there are several “nations” in South Africa—Afrikaners, English, Jews, Indians, Coloureds and Bantu; the last-named being further classified into at least four main “sub-sections” on tribal and linguistic grounds.

congregation and the priest's infirmity of purpose have combined to forbid mixed worship or even the use of the Church building for separate non-white services.

The second and third categories, which comprise the overwhelming majority, are the main problem of the Church today. It is often said, and often with much truth, that the ministry is wrestling with a stubborn and prejudiced laity. But as stated, the problem is oversimplified. Where the priesthood fails, both at the parish and episcopal levels, is not in sharing benighted prejudices and irrational attitudes with their white flock; but in not being always sufficiently aware of the immorality, the un-Christianity of the present apartheid in worship, not perceiving that the message of the Church and its function in society are being vitiated by this failure to practise the unity in Christ that it preaches, in not thus realising the urgency of the problem which "patience" and "time" (so often pleaded) are totally inadequate to solve, in discharging their conscience and their duty too much in exhortation and too infrequently in more direct pressures.

Upholders of the Church's present policy will be able to cite individual instances against the charge—the inter-denominational, inter-racial community at Wilgespruit, near Johannesburg, where white and black work and pray together on funds chiefly subscribed from outside the Union; the refusal of the present Archbishop of Cape Town to consecrate a Johannesburg church the lease of which contained a *caveat* against its use by non-whites; the refusal of the Bishop of Kimberley to accept a church site offered by a municipal authority in his diocese subject to such a clause; mixed worship in a number of parishes, some of it after a battle to obtain or retain it. Against these I will tell one actual story—not the worst, not the best, not typical in all its details, not untypical in the attitudes it suggests.

In 1947 the rector of an Anglican parish in a small country town suffered a nervous breakdown of which the primary cause was his struggle to retain one mixed communion service a month against the wishes of the majority of his council. His successor from England decided that "parish unity" required him to sponsor the council's resolution withdrawing the mixed service and forbidding the use of the church building for separate services. Although the resolution of the council was clearly *ultra vires*, being against the doctrine and discipline of the Church, the bishop said and did nothing. "Parish unity" was restored, white attendance rose and Church funds multiplied. Seven years later that rector was replaced

by another straight from England, who shortly received a request from his African colleague in the nearby location to permit one monthly communion in the "white" church at 5.30 a.m. (the white services begin at 7 a.m.) for African servants employed in the "white area".

Deeming it better, though strictly unnecessary, to carry his council with him, the rector sounded out its 15 members privately and obtained favourable assurances from 11. Two were definitely hostile; two undecided but probably hostile. On the matter being laid before the council in open session, however, four of the "assured" defected and the resolution withdrawing the seven-year-old ban was defeated 8-7. The reasons given ranged from "bugs in the pews" and nauseatingly sanctimonious thunder about the immorality of native girls who would come straight to Church from sleeping with their unmarried boy-friends (a frequent enough occurrence under the system of migratory labour) to the inexpediency of standing out against convention in a Nationalist-dominated countryside (this applied particularly to a railwayman in Government employment, a bank clerk, and a shopkeeper) or the fear that this was "just the thin edge of the wedge" (i.e. the first step towards mixed services, as it possibly is and rightly should be). The priest then approached the new bishop who came as soon as he could. During the months that elapsed all but two of the recalcitrants, who left the Church with their families after the bishop's decision, were more or less reconciled to accepting something for which (as the bishop was imposing it) they could not be held personally responsible; though there was some ominous muttering about what they would do "the day *they* come into Church with us". So now the separate services proceed. The Africans bring their own chalice to forestall any accusation of contamination and the parish has temporarily settled down.

This rather dismal story with its partially successful conclusion makes several points peculiar to the South African scene. There is the irony of the aversion to "*their* coming into Church *with us*". Of course, in every way except that of actually joining in equal worship, they *do* come in to clean and tend our churches, as they tend and clean our homes. The objection is, of course, not to their presence, but to their assuming any status outside the master-servant relationship. Secondly, this incident disproved a widely held belief on the part of whites that, provided there is an African Church within reasonable reach, there is no need or demand for non-white worship in the white church.

Although most Africans live in the locations, servants in the "white areas" live in "quarters" at their employer's residence. In the case in point the African location was three miles from the "white town". When the monthly 5.30 a.m. service for Africans began, it was regularly attended by about one-third of the total number of black communicants living in the "white area". The need was there all right.

Nor should it ever have been doubted, because every Sunday in the heart of that Nationalist-dominated countryside the Roman Catholics' mass in the "white town" was attended by white and black Catholics alike. In this respect the Roman Catholic Church is ahead of all others. Its laity having no control in Church affairs, the hierarchy has been able to disregard ordinary South African lay prejudices, and insist on unity and community within the Church. Few non-Roman Christians in South Africa realise how regular a feature of Roman Catholic worship mixed services are. Here in Port Elizabeth, in the heart of a "white city" now notoriously illiberal, despite good transport to the location and services available there, not less than 25 per cent. of the attendance at mass in the largest Church are non-whites. The difference is that the Roman Catholics have made a point of insisting on mixed worship and gone out of their way, when establishing it, to make sure that non-whites know they are welcome. The Presbyterian Church, and many other Free and Anglican Churches, are theoretically open to non-whites as well as whites. But nothing is done to assure the former that their presence will not merely be tolerated but is actively desired. And non-whites do not come because they fear, often with good reason, that they will be received with resentment or even (despite the theoretical position) actually turned away. This was recently tested by the African assistant editor of the magazine *Drum*. In attempting to attend "white" services he found himself welcomed at 12 out of 13 Roman Catholic Churches and nearly every Anglican Church⁵; he was gladly received at one Methodist Church but shown coldly to the gallery in another; one Presbyterian Church let him in, another turned him away; he was allowed to sit through one D.R.C. service amid "much muttering", others refused him entirely, one threw him out and at yet another the Special Branch (political police) were summoned.

⁵ The Johannesburg diocese, where these events took place, is the most "enlightened" of the Anglican dioceses with the most militant of bishops. Anglican churches would probably have shown a lower percentage elsewhere, certainly if "Mr. Drum's" attendance looked like becoming habitual or the precursor of more substantial African attendance.

For attending a Seventh Day Adventist service he was manhandled and arrested, though the flimsy charges of "trespass" and "squatting" were later withdrawn.

Except where they are *known* to be welcome (and this, in the South African context, implies active measures, not just absence of a constitutional colour bar), non-whites will not ordinarily attend "white" churches. The position in the Cape in regard to the Coloureds is not so much better than for Africans. Various repressive apartheid measures, setting off race from race residentially, and for labour and pass exemption purposes, have led to a devilish form of witch-hunting on both the white and African fringes of the Coloured community, and this has had some deplorable repercussions in their Church life. Dark-skinned Coloureds have been made unwelcome in some churches that admit whites and Coloureds but do not cater for Africans. And some "white only" churches have begun to enquire into the racial qualifications of persons in the large twilight zone between white and Coloured, in which the Government (and some private citizens of malice) are trying to discover differentiation where none is visible.

There is clearly need for a much more positive approach to this question of mixed worship. All Churches, except the Roman Catholics, face the difficulty that authority is circumscribed by the primacy of the individual Christian conscience. But I cannot honestly see how any form of personal segregation—even the "voluntary segregation" sometimes encountered in Roman Catholic churches where non-whites then communicate last—can be justified by the *Christian* conscience, least of all in Church services. The only question, surely, is the best and quickest methods of ending it.

A South African Church so divided within itself as to what might be called its own "internal apartheid" must inevitably fail effectively to carry the message of the Gospel out into its relations with society and the secular state. How can Christian charity "take by storm the citadels of prejudice", when its warriors are themselves "riddled with the colour bar" even in Church? How, indeed, can they even tackle the vulnerable theology of the D.R.C. at the conference table, when the former so obviously practises its ethic of separation more fully than the other Churches practise the unity of all Christians in Christ which they preach?

Here we must take leave of the Roman Catholic Church. For, as elsewhere, it stands apart from all other Churches. Alone having a reasonably clear "internal" conscience, it yet does not intend to crusade from that springboard except on strictly limited issues.

Where the State attacks its own essential Church interests, it resists. Otherwise it disapproves; but does not give a strong verbal, let alone active, lead. It is very conscious of being a small unpopular minority Church in South Africa and concentrates on survival in a hostile environment. It thinks in centuries, not in decades; intends to outlast any secular oppression and still be there, a living organism, to minister to its flock when tyranny has passed by. Even where it has apparently stood firm on a particular issue (e.g. Bantu education), its stand is much more limited than is generally appreciated. It was not, for instance, fighting for African education. It was and is quite prepared to teach the "Bantu syllabuses", desiring only to retain complete control of the spiritual guidance of its African children. In that large sphere of public life which the Roman Catholic Church considers outside its immediate spiritual jurisdiction, it will not appear (with others) to challenge the evils of racial discrimination.⁶

Nor, of course, will the D.R.C. The very few voices raised within the D.R.C. attack general issues only, never specific injustices. Certainly there was the inter-Church, inter-racial conference at Pretoria in December 1954, made possible by money received largely outside the D.R.C. and largely outside South Africa. At this conference white and black ministers occupied the same hall in segregated seats, drank segregated tea and coffee, made tactful speeches (firm in principle but equivocal on application), only occasionally coming to life as with an African minister asking: "If our Lord Jesus Christ came into this room, on which side would He sit?" It was something that the meeting was held at all. It may have sown a few seeds of new growth within the D.R.C., but these will take long to ripen—too long to affect the crisis of Church and State in South Africa today. It may have bred a little more tolerance in some of the other Churches, but at the risk that their sense of urgency may have been further submerged.

Was it a sign of new grace that an African minister last March was elected an assessor at the synod of the D.R.C. Mission Church in the Eastern Transvaal? Hardly, since his message was the

⁶. There has, of course, been no authoritative Roman Catholic comment on Father Huddleston's book. But the review in the Roman Catholic weekly, *Southern Cross*, is significant. The writer, a Dominican priest, said that *baasskap* (boss-ship; "white man boss") is not as completely ruthless as Father Huddleston suggests. The backgrounds of the European and native are so different that they cannot be "assimilated". (All Europeans? All Africans?) Therefore, the former is afflicted with the emotion known theologically as "horror", derived from ignorance and fear of the powerful unknown. But this, the reviewer believes, is mitigated by considerable generosity and a desire to combine the preservation of European culture with "a fair deal for the majority of natives".

entirely unrepresentative one (so gratifying to white ears) that "the development of the native will be gradual and I do not believe a time will come when the native will no longer need the help of the European". Mr. Tema was probably quite sincere. But all over the country "yes-men" are arising among the Africans to climb on the apartheid bandwagon for the sake of the various favours in Dr. Verwoerd's gift—increased powers and pay as Bantu Authorities (i.e. tribal pseudo-chiefs), or posts in Bantu Education and the Native Affairs Department. Inevitably, Mr. Tema's voice will be confused with theirs and whatever message he may have to pass on to his white colleagues in the D.R.C. will suffer thereby. Events in South Africa will not wait for the D.R.C. to sort out its mind, now tentatively astir after three centuries of intellectual isolation. And, for long yet, the main body of the D.R.C. will continue to provide its laity, whose favourite texts are pre-Christian, with a firm theological basis for the ethic of separation, discrimination and enforced inferiority.

And so we return to the Churches other than the D.R.C. and R.C. These would generally agree that the social problems of mankind are the rightful concern of Christians. Many of their members probably share the contemporary greater awareness of social rather than personal sin and the consciousness that Christianity and social injustice are not compatible. But the manifest fact is that the message of the Church and its witness in society is quite fatally impaired by the colour bar within. Thus every exhortation and condemnation by Church leaders is met by that irrepressible ecclesiastical controversialist, Mr. Eric Louw (S.A. Minister of External Affairs), with enquiries about the extent to which apartheid is practised in the services and schools of the Church. To this baiting the Church really has no answer. Not only is there apartheid for congregations and pupils; but in at least one case (and in how many others is such an experiment even attempted?) the parents and old boys of an Anglican "white" school (St. Andrew's) prevented an African priest from preaching a sermon in the school or officiating at Holy Communion. Only the other day a Diocesan Synod was in trouble for appointing a "European" supervisor of Sunday schools. When African priests questioned the necessity of specifying the man's race, the lame excuse was made that "a fully trained person" was required—this in the oldest diocese of the Anglican Church in South Africa. By such little incidents does the Church reveal its unpreparedness for the challenge of the hour.

In the same diocese, again, lives the Rev. James Calata, Anglican priest of Cradock. At the time of the Defiance (passive resistance) Campaign in 1952 many African priests were penalised for lending their moral and active support by the Government's withdrawing their marriage licences and travel concessions. Most of these sanctions were subsequently lifted. But in the case of Mr. Calata, who is a prominent and active member of the African National Congress, the withdrawal is permanent and his permit to purchase communion wine has also been put on a monthly basis. Yet his diocese slumbers on unprotesting, keeping the silence that the Church kept over the proscription as "statutory Communists" of African Christians like Oliver Tambo (Anglican) and ex-Chief Albert James Luthuli, President-General of the African National Congress, a man widely respected for his Christian liberalism. Now, of course, Africans in the "white areas" are being segregated away in fenced and controlled locations, separated from the rest of humanity by 500-yard "buffer strips" on which there may be neither building nor playing field nor cemetery. The sites of Church buildings have been reduced to an annual basis, subjected to three months notice of cancellation "if in the opinion of the Minister for Native Affairs (Dr. Verwoerd) the activities of the occupier or any of his representatives, whether on the site or elsewhere, are such as to encourage deterioration in the relationships between Natives and Governmental persons or bodies". Presumably all Anglican sites everywhere *could* be terminated because of any priest's activities. If the Government has so far shown no desire to come into direct conflict with the Churches, this is partly because the Churches have often shown an even stronger desire to avoid precipitating a clash.

South Africa, however, is clearly heading for a situation in which the Churches will have to insist on crossing the legal and administrative barriers being placed between the races or abdicate its ministry to non-whites. For the doctrine of residential and social apartheid intends almost complete severance of normal contact across the colour bar and the prohibition of "non-native persons" from regularly working in African locations. Some Churches, like the Methodist, despite expressions of regret, handed over the burden of their mission schools with private relief to Verwoerd's "Bantu Education" (whereby Africans are to be taught that "there is no place for them in the white society above the level of certain forms of labour") in order to devote their resources entirely to evangelisation. Such voluntary surrender of responsibilities must

look to Africans like desertion in the hour of their greatest need; and this will affect the whole future relationship between them and the Church, however narrowly its functions are conceived. Nor, surely, is the attitude of "don't let's be beastly" or the even commoner "Leave it to us on the spot; we know how to handle these people" even remotely appropriate to the present phase in South Africa.⁷

For the situation is far, far worse as regards non-whites (especially Africans) than is generally realised. Against the facts of urban African living conditions it is irrelevant to urge that we spend more per head on "uplifting" them (and less in proportion to our national income, as the only wealthy industrial state in Africa) than any other territory on the continent. What we stand condemned for is our blasphemous intention, our *direction*, our determination to extend separation and maintain subordination until the end of time. This attitude was expressed in an exaggerated and possibly deranged form in a letter to me from an adherent of a Christian sect, a sort of hysterical outburst from the dark sub-conscious mind of white South Africa. "Your article⁸ in defence of Huddleston's book is even more blasphemous than the *evil* book itself. I pray that the good loving Almighty God will send a plague *soon*, to destroy every cursed, repulsive, beer-sodden, wool-headed Negro and Missionary bastard in the whole world. Neither you nor Huddleston, Scott, Collins or Fisher⁹ can raise what God has cursed. I pray that God will mete out punishment till the likes of you and Huddleston stop trying to raise what God has abased. It is incredible that any European could be so depraved as to live

⁷. One has only to think of the utter inadequacy of the Archbishop of Canterbury's otherwise unexceptionable plea for more courtesy as the sole key to better race relations, of the failure of any Anglican bishop to speak up for Father Huddleston when he was viciously attacked from the privileged platform of Parliament, or of the leading Free Churchman (well known for his spirited denunciations of apartheid) who had one of his ministers transferred for being 'tactless' about the colour bar. This last incident occurred in the same district as the Anglican parish which banned non-whites from its church. In this case the Methodist minister caused a furore among his white flock by inviting African Methodists to attend meetings in his house. His wife overheard a conversation in the street: 'I don't know what the town is coming to. The Anglican minister wants to have kaffirs in his church and the Methodist to invite them to his house'.

⁸. A favourable review of Father Huddleston's "Naught For Your Comfort" in the April 7, 1956, issue of the Evening Post, circulating throughout the Eastern Cape Province. The letter quoted came from East London, an anti-Nationalist stronghold.

⁹. Rev. Michael Scott, predecessor of Huddleston as militant spokesman for and servant of the African people. A regular petitioner at the United Nations.

Canon L. J. Collins of St. Paul's Cathedral, frequent outspoken critic of S.A. race policies. Dr. Geoffrey Fisher, Archbishop of Canterbury, who regularly features as a member of this quadrumvirate in my correspondent's diatribe, presumably because he advocates decent treatment and good manners.

amongst thousands of wool-headed, cursed, evil beasts for even 12 hours, let alone 12 years . . . A God of love would *not* be so unkind as to make anything so hideous as a wool-headed, repulsive kaffir, as God is responsible for everything Good and Beautiful, and the Devil for everything ugly and sin . . .”

At the other end of the intellectual scale come these comments from a liberal-minded Johannesburg periodical in a discussion with the Bishop of Johannesburg: “One must concede the one true fact [*sic*], namely, that an almost complete intellectual, social and sociological *incompatibility* exists between white and black. If we accept the view that this state of *repulsion* is an unavoidable product of the South African setting, what is the next step? If we must have European domination—and we must have it—how are we going to prevent the moral degeneration of Europeans?” How indeed? And the climate in which Father Huddleston’s arguments find their setting is further defined by the leader of the white so-called Opposition, Mr. J. G. N. Strauss, calling for silence about the book lest controversy increase its sales. “The country knows we (the United Party) have nothing to do with Father Huddleston and do not share his views. Let us rather” (addressing Prime Minister J. G. Strijdom, the chief apostle of *baasskap*, boss-ship) “in a positive way speak with a united voice.” This is the authentic voice of white South Africa.

In this climate, and in the context of an already established police state, so far as Africans are concerned, must Father Huddleston’s opinion be considered that “there is only one really vital issue confronting the Church in South Africa today, and I do not think the Church is facing it as boldly as it should, as it *must*, if it is to be true to its Master and itself.” All Africa today awaits the Church’s reply to the question: “Who is my neighbour?” Jesus gave it in the parable of the Good Samaritan. Dare the Church pass by on the other side?¹⁰

¹⁰. The following letter from an African woman recently appeared in the press:—“The white men came to this country and told us about Christianity and the happiness of the Christian. We joined them, out of the promise of their Christianity. But the happiness we are getting is the pass (about to be extended to women, as well as men—C.W.M.G.), which is taking us to prison cells, to be prisoners instead of Christians.

“Now I am even sorry to have joined them. But the new Church I have joined is the African National Congress. In this Church there is no colour bar and no apartheid which says don’t love thy neighbour as thyself.”