



# PRO VERITATE

**DIE AFRIKAANSE KERKE EN DIE  
KOMENDE VERKIESING**

Beyers Naude

**SAL EK OFFER WAT JY VRA?**

Ben Engelbrecht

**MOEDSWILLIGE MISVERSTAND**

Bruckner de Villiers

**FOOLS OR ANGELS?**

Dania van Zyl

**DEVELOPMENT IN DEVELOPMENT**

Mark Collier

**DISCARDED PEOPLE**

Nadine Gordimer and Dave Adler

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

# PRO VERITATE

## REDAKSIE

REDAKTEUR (WAARN.):  
Dr. W. B. de Villiers.

REDAKSIONELE KOMITEE:  
Biskop B. B. Burnett; Eerw. J. de  
Gruchy; Eerw. A. W. Habelgaarn;  
Eerw. E. E. Mahabane; Mnr. J. E.  
Moulder; Ds. C. F. B. Naudé  
(Voorsitter); 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)  
— Oossee; 17/6 — Engeland.

Lugpos: R2-00 (£1 of \$2.80) —  
Afrika; R3-50 (£1/17/6 of \$5.00)  
— Oossee; £2 — Engeland.

Tjeks en postorders moet uitgemaak  
word aan Pro Veritate (Edms.) Bpk.,  
Posbus 31135, Braamfontein, Johan-  
nesburg.

## LET WEL

Die redaksie van Pro Veritate ver-  
klaar dat hy nie verantwoordelik is vir  
menings en standpunte wat in enige  
ander artikel van hierdie blad ver-  
skyn as die inleidingsartikel en redak-  
sionele verklarings nie.

PRO VERITATE verskyn elke 15de  
van die maand.

(Prys per enkel-eksemplaar 10c)

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

CHRISTIAN MONTHLY FOR SOUTHERN AFRICA  
CHRISTELIKE MAANDBLAD VIR SUIDELIKE AFRIKA

## IN HIERDIE UITGAWE...

● Ds. Beyers Naudé, Direkteur van die  
Christelike Instituut, beskryf hoe die  
Algemene Verkiesing die Afrikaanse  
kerke affekteer, en andersom.

● In 'n vlymskerpe antwoord op dr.  
Nik Lee verwerp dr. Ben Engelbrecht  
die valse vorm en interpretasie van  
die gereformeerde wat aangetref  
word onder apartheidspologete.

● Dr. Bruckner de Villiers, 'n oogge-  
tuig en deelnemer aan die debat,  
gee 'n hou-vir-hou relaas van die  
gebeure tydens die onlangse sinode  
van die Gereformeerde Kerke in  
Nederland te Lunteren.

● 'n Binnestaandersrapport oor die  
probleme waarmee die Onafhank-  
like Bantoekeke te kampe het, word  
verskaf deur ds. Danie van Zyl, amp-  
telike raadgewer van AICA.

● Mark Collier gaan in op die begrip  
van ontwikkeling wat tans soveel  
aandag geniet in kerklike kringe.

Alle politieke kommentaar in hierdie  
uitgawe deur C. F. B. Naudé en W. B.  
de Villiers, van Dunwell 301, Jorissen-  
straat 35, Braamfontein, en B. Engel-  
brecht, van Greenweg 26, Greenside,  
Johannesburg.

## IN THIS ISSUE...

● The Rev. Beyers Naudé, Director of  
the Christian Institute, delineates  
the effect of the General Election  
upon the Afrikaans churches and  
vice-versa.

● In a razor-edged reply to Dr. Nik  
Lee, Dr. Ben Engelbrecht rejects the  
spurious form and interpretation of  
Reformed dogma encountered  
among apartheid apologists.

● Dr. Bruckner de Villiers, an eye-  
witness and a participant in the  
debate, gives a blow by blow ac-  
count of what happened during the  
recent synod at Lunteren of the  
Gereformeerde Kerke in the Neth-  
erlands.

● An insider's report on the problems  
encountered by the African Inde-  
pendent Churches is provided by the  
Rev. Danie van Zyl, official adviser  
to AICA.

● Mark Collier deals with the con-  
cept of development which is at  
present eliciting so much attention  
in church circles.

All political comment in this issue by  
C. F. B. Naudé and W. B. de Villiers,  
of 301, Dunwell, 35 Jorissen Street,  
Braamfontein, and B. Engelbrecht, of  
26 Greenway, Greenside, Johannesburg.

## Inleidingsartikel:

*'n Kruis vir Christus*

Op 22 April gaan die nog stemgeregtigde, blanke burgers van ons land na die stembus om namens hulleself en hul kinders — en namens die miljoene nie-blanke, stemlose, medeburgers van ons land, en hulle kinders — 'n kruis te maak op 'n stembrief wat sal bepaal wie ons sentrale landsregering sal vorm en, uiteindelik, hoé hulle sal regeer.

Dié keuses het 'n keuse tussen vyf politieke partye en hul beginsels en tussen 406 kandidate in 155 bestrede parlementêre setels. Hulle is reeds en word toenemend oorval deur 'n magdom politieke beleidsverklarings en verkiesingsmanifeste in 'n poging om hul keuse te beïnvloed en hul stem te verower. Onder hierdie verkiesingsmanifeste is daar ook een wat géén party steun of verteenwoordiging nie, maar wat eenvoudig bekend staan as die **Christelike** Verkiesingsmanifest: die sg. „Twaalf Stellinge vir Oorweging deur alle Stemregtige Christene in die Republiek van Suid-Afrika”.

Hierdie manifest is uitgevaardig deur sewentig feilbare dog bekommerde volgelinge van Jesus van Nasaret, die Gekruisigde, en Sy lewensleer: 'n leer waarvolgens ons ons naaste (hoe primitief, onontwikkeld, onderontwikkeld, veragtelik ook al) moet liefhê soos onself; ons aan andere (hoe verskillend ook al van onself) moet doen soos ons aan onself gedaan wil hê; ons aan die nietigste van Sy beskermlinge moet doen dit wat ons graag aan Christus self sou wou doen.

Dit is Sy leer, Sy eis, Sy oproep tot al Sy volgelinge, ook tydens die aanstaande verkiesing.

Volgens die mees onlangse (1968) statistiek is daar 3,639,000 Blankes in ons land van wie die oor-grote meerderheid, nl. 2,468,944, „Christene”, d.w.s. belydende volgelinge van die grootste Volksleier van alle tye is, die Stigter van die Koninkryk van Christus op aarde.

Van dié 2½ miljoen volgelinge, of namens hulle, eis Hy, ook tydens die aanstaande verkiesing, trou, loyaliteit en gehoorsame navolgenskap. Ook tydens hierdie verkiesing sal Sy volgelinge — na deeglike ondersoek van hul eie Christelike verantwoordelikheid — blootgestel word aan 'n goddelike toets en sal van hulle geverg word 'n duidelike keuse vir Christus of téén Hom.

Twee-duisend jaar gelede is daar ook so 'n toets aan mense gestel. Toe het hulle vir Christus 'n kruis opgerig en Hom gekruisig. Maar toe, met 'n paar uitsonderinge, was hulle nie Sy volgelinge nie en het hulle nie in Hom geglo nie. Vandag is dit anders (of is dit?). Hier in Suid-Afrika alleen is daar 2½ miljoen mense wat amptelik en openlik verklaar dat hulle in Hom glo.

En tog stel Hy sy volgelinge weer eens, en ewe dringend, op die proef en stel Hy hulle weer eens voor 'n keuse: vir Hom of téén Hom; Christus gekroon of gekruisig; 'n kruis vir Christus op die stembrief of weer eens 'n Kruis vir Hom opgerig op Golgota.

## Editorial:

*A Cross for Christ*

On April 22 the still enfranchised white citizens of our country are going to the polls to make a cross on a ballot paper, on behalf of themselves and their children — and on behalf of the millions of the non-whites, voteless, fellow-citizens of our country and **their** children — to determine who shall constitute the central government of our country and, ultimately, how it shall be governed.

The voters have a choice between five political parties and their policies and between 406 candidates in 155 contested parliamentary constituencies. They have been and are increasingly being swamped by a plenitude of political statements of policy and election manifestos in an attempt to influence their choice and capture their votes. Among these election manifestos there is also one which supports or represents no party, but which is simply known as the **Christian** Election Manifesto; the so-called "Twelve Statements for the Consideration of all Christian Voters in the Republic of South Africa."

This manifesto was issued by seventy fallible though concerned followers of Jesus of Nazareth, the Crucified, and His doctrine of life, a doctrine according to which we must love our neighbour (however primitive, underdeveloped, despicable) as we love ourselves, we must do unto others (however different from ourselves) what we would have done unto ourselves, we must do to the lowliest of His protégées what we would gladly do unto Christ Himself.

This is His doctrine, His injunction, His call to all His followers, also during the coming election.

According to the most recent (1968) figures, there are 3,639,000 Whites in our country of whom the vast majority, viz. 2,468,944, are "Christians", i.e. confessing followers of the all-time greatest Leader of His people, the Founder of the Kingdom of Christ on earth.

During the coming election He demands of these 2½ million followers, or on behalf of them, faithfulness, loyalty and obedience towards Himself. During this election, too, His followers will — after a thorough examination of their own Christian responsibility — be subjected to a divine test and a clear choice **for** Christ or **against** Him will be demanded of them.

Two thousand years ago such a test was also posed to men. Then they erected a cross for Christ and crucified Him. But then, with a few exceptions, they were not His followers and did not believe in Him. Today things have changed (or have they?). Here in South Africa alone there are 2½ million people who officially and openly profess to be His followers.

And yet, once again and just as urgently, He puts His followers to the test and once again asks them to choose: for Him or against Him; Christ crowned or crucified; a cross for Christ on the ballot paper or, once again, a Cross erected for Him on Golgotha.



# Die Afrikaanse Kerke en die Komende Verkiesing

— BEYERS NAUDÉ

As van tyd tot tyd die bewering gemaak word dat die Afrikaanse Kerke nie deel het aan die politiek en daar nie aan meedoën nie, kan 'n mens net glimlag. Want ek glo nie dat daar êrens in die wêreld 'n „Christen“-gemeenskap is waar kerk, kultuur en politiek so aaneengestrengeel en met mekaar vermeng is as by ons Afrikaners nie.

Dink maar net aan die preke en toesprake op ons Geloftedagvieringe waar dit uiters moeilik (indien nie onmoontlik) is om te onderskei tussen die spreke van die Woord van God en die woord van die volk. Dink maar net aan die etlike honderde predikante en sendelinge van die drie Afrikaanse Kerke wat lede is van die Afrikaner Broederbond wie se omsendbriewe 'n keurige mengsel bied van kerklike, kulturele, politieke, sosiale en ekonomiese opdragte om die belange van die Afrikaner bo dié van ander volksgroepe te bevorder. (As die Broederbond die vrymoedigheid besit om te openbaar hoe groot dié getal is, sal dit stellig my bewering bevestig en versterk).

## BO POLITIEK

As dus 'n Afrikaanse Kerk soos die Nederduitse Hervormde Kerk van Afrika 'n verklaring uitreik dat die Kerk bo en buite die partypolitiek staan (soos 'n paar dae gelede gebeur het), dan moet 'n mens jouself dadelik afvra wat daartoe die aanleiding gegee het en wat daaragter sit. In hierdie geval was die aanleiding 'n twaalf bladsye-lange loflied in *Ster Aktueel*, die politieke bylaag van *Ster*, op die N.H. Kerk, waarin op 'n baie subtiel manier die standpunte en optrede van die N.H. Kerk aan die politieke siening van die H.N. Party gekoppel word.

Ek kan nie verstaan waarom die N.H. Kerk so angstig was om indirek die assosiasie van die Kerk en talle van sy predikante met die H.N. Party te ontken of te probeer verberg nie, tensy dit is dat dié Kerk bang is dat 'n oorwinning vir die Nasionale Party op 22 April sy posisie by die volk kan bemocilik of benadeel. 'n Mens wonder of die verklaring sou verskyn het as die H.N. Party verseker was van 'n mooi oorwinning.

Maar afgesien hiervan bring die geskiedenis ons tog oorfloedige bewyse van die noue verbintenis van die Afrikaanse Kerke en die Afrikanervolk. Seker in geen ander gods-

dienstige gemeenskap ter wêreld (behalwe miskien by die Joodse volk) was die hand tussen Kerk en volk so nou as by die Afrikaner nie. En tot op sekere hoogte was dit aan te prys omdat dit die bewys gelewer het van die vereenselwiging van die geestelike leiers met die nood en worsteling van die volk aan wie hulle die Evangelie bedien het.

Die probleem is egter dat dié verbintenis so 'n noue geword het en die vereenselwiging met die politieke en kulturele aspirasies van die Afrikanervolk so volkome dat dit vandag byna onmoontlik geword het om tussen die „christelik“ en „nasionaal“ van „Christelik-nasionaal“ te onderskei. Dit het voorwaar 'n geval geword (waar dit die politiek raak) van *vox populi vox Dei*. Geen wonder dat dr. J. S. Gericks by die onlangse sameprekinge van sommige Afrikaanse Kerke te Lunteren, Holland dit nodig geag het om tydens sy toespraak sydelings te vermeld dat die afgevaardigdes van die Afrikaanse Kerke nie as politici, maar as Kerkmanne aan die besprekinge kom deelneem nie.

## VERWIKKELINGE

Onder normale omstandighede sou dié houding teenoor die politiek die oorgrote meerderheid van die lidmate van ons Afrikaanse Kerke nie gehinder of in die war gebring het nie as dit nie vir die volgende verwickelinge was nie:

Eerstens is daar die duidelike aksentverskille en anderse benadering en beoordeling van die huidige landspolitiek deur leiers van die Gereformeerde Kerk in Suid-Afrika in teenstelling met die ander twee Afrikaanse Kerke van Gereformeerde belydenis. In groter gehoorsaamheid aan Gods Woord tree daar stadig maar seker 'n ander uitkyk en norm van beoordeling na vore by die *Woord en Daad*-groep van Potchefstroom wat 'n ernstige uitdaging begin word vir die tradisionele opvattinge oor kerklike eenheid en pluriformiteit, oor die kwessie van gemengde huwelik, oor

die Bybelse konsep van geregtigheid en naasteliefde — en so meer. Die feit dat die onlangse Sinode van die Gereformeerde Kerk (Suid-Afrika) 'n besluit oor die Skrif se standpunt t.o.v. gemengde huwelike geneem het wat vir die oorgrote meerderheid van goeie Afrikaner-Nasionaliste 'n doring in die vlees moet wees, laat 'n mens besef dat hier stadig maar seker 'n situasie aan die ontwikkel is wat polities gesproke ernstige probleme gaan skep vir die tradisionele eenheidsbenadering van die Afrikaner.

Tweedens is daar die voltrokke splitsing in die politieke geledere van die Nasionale Party wat die Afrikanergemeenskap van bo tot onder verdeel het en 'n golf van bitterheid oor ons laat heenspoel het wat alleen moontlik is in die felheid van twis waar broer teen broer, Broeder teen Broeder, vriend teen vriend en huis teen huis te staan gekom het. Ek wonder of daar 'n enkele Afrikaanse gesin is waar hierdie splitsing nie ervaar of gevoel word nie.

En om die saak te vererger kom nou die anonieme skrywer van *Ster Aktueel* en speel hy die N.H. Kerk af teen die N.G. Kerk in 'n duidelike poging om die N.H. Kerk aan die Hertzog-volgelingen se politieke wa te koppel en die N.G. Kerk te dwing om te sê waar hy staan. Tot dusver het die N.G. Kerk nog nie amptelik gereageer nie hoewel twee predikante van die N.G. Kerk presies teenoorgestelde standpunte ingeneem het oor die vraag of 'n mens voor die verkiesing 'n politieke vergadering met gebed behoort te open. Ds. D. F. Malan van Melville sê: Nee — dit doen ek nie; ds. N. J. van Loggerenberg van Farrarmere sê: Ja — dit doen ek wel. ('n Mens mag in jou nuuskierigheid seker wel vra watter soort gebed ds. van Loggerenberg sal opstuur as hy 'n politieke vergadering van die Verenigde of die Progressiewe Party met gebed moet open).

## EENHEID VERBREEK

Een ding is egter duidelik: nie alleen het die koms en optrede van die Herstigtes die historiese eenheid van die Afrikaner ru verbreek nie, maar

(Vervolg op bladsy 10)



# SAL EK OFFER WAT JY VRA ?

BEN ENGELBRECHT

In *Die Kerkbode* van 11 Maart 1970 het daar 'n brief verskyn van dr. Nik Lee, 'n predikant van die Ned. Geref. Kerk, waarin die Christelike „verkiessings-manifes” oftewel die „Twaalf stellinge vir oorweging deur alle stemgeregtigde Christene in die Republiek van Suid-Afrika” ontleed word. Hierdie twaalf stellinge het reeds voorheen in *Pro Veritate* verskyn en die lesers is waarskynlik vertrou daarmee.

My eerste reaksie op dr. Lee se brief in *Die Kerkbode* was een van verslaenheid. Ek staan trouens nou nog verslae daaroor. Dit gaan my verstand te bowe dat iemand dit wat dr. Lee in hierdie twaalf stellinge ingelees het, daar kon inlees. Dit is so vergesog en so bevooroordeelde dat dit vir die opstellers van die Christelike manifes net nie meer moontlik is om daarop te antwoord nie. Dis it soos wanneer iemand duidelik en uitdruklik „A” sê, en hom tot sy verbystering toegewerp kry: „Hoor daar, hy sê „B””.

Ek het dan ook geen voorneme of begeerte om dr. Lee te probeer antwoord nie. 'n Diskussie oor die politiek wat tans in Suid-Afrika gevoer word, en wat uitgaan van die grondwaarhede van die Christelike geloof, het m.i. sinloos geword. Dr. Lee se brief aan *Die Kerkbode* is vir my 'n sprekende simptome van hierdie sinloosheid. Die verabsoluttering van die apartheidsideologie as die eksklusief Christelike, moes daarop uitloop. Tensy die Skrif en sy uitsprake so geïnterpreteer word dat dit aan apartheid ondergeskik is en daaraan diensbaar gestel kan word, val dit geheel en al daarbuite. Dr. Lee spreek slegs die bekende taal wat enigeen van die kerklike of teologiese toonaangewers van die Ned. Geref. Kerk ook kan spreek. Dit sou 'n aanvaarde stuk van die Algemene Sinode kon word.

Dit sou futiel wees om hieroor 'n redenasie te probeer voer. Hoe sielsvermoeiend dit is, kan miskien uit die volgende voorbeelde vir my lesers duidelik word. Ek noem eers die stelling soos dit in die Manifes staan, en dan enkele grepe uit dr. Lee se vertolking en kommentaar.

## STELLINGE

**Stelling 2:** Die politiek hou hom besig met die inrigting van die samelewing en affekteer daarom die lewens van mense, geskape na die beeld van God, ten diepste.

**Vertolking:** Deur te beweer dat die gevalle mens vandag steeds die beeld van God is, word die totale verdorwenheid van die mens hier implisiet geloën.

**Stelling 3:** Dit is die Christen se plig om deur sy stem by te dra tot die instelling van 'n landsregering wat wet en orde sal handhaaf en die

belange en welvaart van die hele samelewing waaroor hy aangestel is, sal bevorder ooreenkomstig die Bybelse geboeie van waarheid, geregtigheid en liefde.

**Vertolking:** In stelling drie en vier van die Manifes word die taak van die staat feitlik primêr omskrywe as die bevordering van „die belange en welvaart van die hele samelewing” en die „algemene welsyn”. Hierdie suiwer-utilitariese dwaling is lynreg in stryd met die Heilige Skrif, wat leer dat die primêre kwalifiserende taak van die staat *die handhawing van wet en orde is*.

**Stelling 5:** In sy skeppingsdaad en in sy verlossingsdaad openbaar God dat Hy besorg is sowel oor die menslike gemeenskap as oor die lewe en lotgevalle van elke enkeling. Hieraan is die intrinsieke waarde wat die Christen aan die gemeenskap en aan die waardigheid van elke individu heg, te danke.

**Vertolking:** Hierdie voorstelling veronderstel dat Christus *elke* enkeling verlos of wil verlos — 'n wydverspreide, dog nietemin erg-ketterse, dwaling in stryd met sowel die Dordtse Leerreëls as met die Skrif self.

**Stelling 8:** In gehoorsaamheid aan God kan geen Christen 'n politieke beleid ondersteun wat gebaseer is op 'n konsekwent gedwonge skeiding van die burgers van dieselfde land en 'n onregverdige diskriminasie tussen hulle in die arbitrêre erkenning van regte op grond van kleur, ras, godsdiens of geslag alleen nie. Die mens se sondige skeidings- en verdelingsdrang druis lynreg in teen die versoeningsboodskap van die Bybel.

**Kommentaar:** Gods Woord eis juis „diskriminasie” op grond van ras, geslag en veral godsdiens.

Gods Woord leer 'n gedwonge skeiding van rasse en nasies en godsdienste sonder hulle toestemming. Nie God se toestemming nie, maar die humanistiese toestemming van die mens en sy sogenaamd „vrye wil” is hier vir die Manifes deurslaggewend.

Gods Woord leer dat God die gelowiges van die wêreldlinge skei, en die skape van die bokke, maar die Manifes oordeel dat hierdie Bybelse „diskriminasie en skeiding” 'n „sondige drang” is — net omdat dit lynreg indruis teen sy eie boodskap van die algemene versoening.

**Stelling 9:** In gehoorsaamheid aan God kan geen Christen 'n politieke beleid ondersteun wat klaarblyklik prakties onuitvoerbaar is en wat daarom op 'n valse aanspraak, d.w.s. 'n verkragting van die waarheid, berus nie.

**Kommentaar:** Hiermee word bedoel die moeilik-toepasbare beleid van gebiedskeiding tussen wit en swart. Alleen die toekoms sal leer of dit prakties uitvoerbaar is of nie — maar intussen is die Manifes se Negende Stelling besig om die Negende Gebod te oortree, want die Manifes mag nie valse getuieis teen sy naaste spreek nie — ook nie wanneer die naaste 'n politieke party of partye is wat aparte ontwikkeling voorstaan nie!

**Stelling 10:** In gehoorsaamheid aan God kan geen Christen 'n politieke beleid ondersteun wat vir sy toepassing in die praktyk onvermydelik openlike of bedekte onreg teenoor teenoor enige individu of bevolkingsgroep veroorsaak nie. 'n Beleid wat klaarblyklik die menswaardigheid van enige landsburger aantast, krenk of skaad, moet vir die Christen in sy geheel verwerplik wees.

**Kommentaar:** Ons sou graag hier wil verneem of die Manifes se opstellers meen dat die „menswaardigheid van enige landsburgers” aangetas word wanneer 'n moordenaar ter dood veroordeel word, wanneer 'n opstandige groep studente vasgevat word, wanneer Kommuniste verbied word om onderwysers en advokate te word of wanneer die Here Sêlf tallose sondaars in die ewige verderf werp?

**Stelling 11:** In gehoorsaamheid aan God kan geen Christen 'n politieke beleid ondersteun wat in sy



wese op groepsselfsug berus en die eensydige bevordering van seksionele belange beoog nie. So 'n beleid moet onvermydelik gepaard gaan met die beoefening van gevoelloosheid en liefdeloosheid en moet gevolglik indruis teen die liefdeswet wat Christus aan sy volgefinge gegee het.

*Kommentaar:* Hier blyk dit dat die Manifeste altruïstiese selfverloëning voorstaan, terwyl die Woord van God aan die ander kant die ware selfliefde eis.

*Stelling 12:* Dit is die Christen se dure plig en verantwoordelikheid om die beleid van elke politieke party in Suid-Afrika deeglik te ondersoek en hom van die praktiese implikasies daarvan te vergewis. Hierin moet hy alle politieke uitsprake en beleidsrigtings toets aan die waarheid van God. Die stemgeregtigde Christen moet daarteen waak dat hy hom nie laat meevoer tot 'n terugval op beslissinge wat op persoonlike of groepsselfsug berus nie. Sy verantwoordelikheid word des te groter in 'n politieke samelewing waar, prakties gesproke, die lede van die sentrale parlement deur 'n klein minderheid burgers verkies word.

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

*Kommentaar:* Met ander woorde, die Christen mag nie terugval tot 'n konserwatiewe politieke party nie, maar hy mag alleen vooruitgryp na 'n progressiewe party — 'n party waar nóg God nóg Christus nóg die Bybel in sy beleidsverklaring mag meesprek.

## GEREFORMEERD

Ek moet my lesers om verskoning vra vir hierdie uitvoerige teenoormekaarstelling van die stellings van die Christelike Manifeste en dr. Lee se kommentaar daarop. Dit is inderdaad 'n geestelike marteling en in die grond van die saak 'n tydverkwisting. Op so 'n afgrondelike dieptevlak is geen sinvolle gedagtewisseling meer moontlik nie. Ek sien dus daarvan af om dr. Lee te probeer antwoord en volstaan met die opmerking dat ek, as mede-opsteller en mede-ondertekenaar van hierdie Manifeste, elke woord daarvan onderskryf, en wel omdat dit in ooreenstemming is met wat ek as gereformeerde Christen glo. En ek wil arrogant genoeg wees om die ganse leërskaars van gerefor-

meedes van dr. Lee se soort uit te daag om my, as lidmaat van die Ned. Geref. Kerk, nie by wyse van skeldbrief in Die Kerkbode nie, maar op 'n billike wyse onder verhoor te neem en vanweë my hartgrondige verwerping van die soort gereformeerderheid en my onderskrywing van elke woord van die Christelike Manifeste, aan die hand van die Skrif en die „ongereformeerderheid” te probeer gereformeerde belydenisskrifte aan skuldig vind. Ek wil selfs so ver gaan om te sê dat, as dit wat dr. Lee hier as „gereformeerde” verkondig, inderdaad deur die Ned. Geref. Kerk as gereformeerde beskou word, ons die Here ernstig moet bid om ons van hierdie „gereformeerderheid” te verlos en tot Christus en sy evangelie te keer. D.w.s. as dit as „gereformeerde” beskou word dat daar uit die Skrif afgelees moet word dat God nie besorg is óók oor die enkeling in die gemeenskap nie; dat Jesus slegs 'n versoening is vir „ons” sondes en nie vir dié van die hele wêreld nie; dat dit 'n kettery is om die evangelie so te verkondig of dat dit onmoontlik is om die evangelie so te verkondig sonder om te verval in die kettery van die „algemene versoening”; dat Gods Woord diskriminasie op grond van ras eis; dat uit Gen. 11:1-9 die bybelse gebod afgelees kan word vir 'n „konsekwente gedwonge skeiding van die burgers van dieselfde land en 'n onregverdig diskriminasie tussen hulle . . .”; dat dit 'n oortreding van die negende gebod is om, nadat die Nasionale Party 22 jaar lank aan bewind was, kategoriees te verklaar dat sy beleid van „regverdige” rasseapartheid prakties onuitvoerbaar is; dat die Skrif nie altruïstiese selfverloëning leer nie, maar „die ware selfliefde eis; ens., ens.

**Dr. Lee se Kerkbode-brief werp ek hiermee dus wat my betref, in die snippermandjie van ongereformeerde rommel. Wat my egter bybly is die onaangename herinnering dat dit so 'n tipiese voorbeeld is van die manier waarop enige vorm van outentiek Christelike getuïenis in politieke aangeleenthede in ons land tans — en vir baie jare al — mishandel word.**

Die Christelike getuïenis moet die beleid van apartheid, soos in ons land geleer en toegepas, veroordeel. Die keuse lê tussen die blanke nasionalistiese ideologie en die evangelie van Christus. Niks kan 'n mens so grondig daarvan oortuig as wanneer jy dit self 'n keer waag om vanuit die Christelike geloof waaruit jy lewe, kritiek uit te spreek teen die

politiek van die dag nie. Dan word dit vir jou ontwyfelbaar duidelik dat jy hier met twee here te doen het (h en H) wat absoluut uitsluitend teenoor mekaar staan. Daar is geen ooreenstemming tussen die Jesus van wie die Skrifte ons leer en die apartheidsgod en heiland nie. 'n Volstrek anti-evangeliese interpretasie van die Christelike evangelie, gesanksioneer deur 'n Christelike kerk, is vir die apartheidsideologie nodig om sy laaste band met die Christelike te behou, nl. die kwalifikasie „Christelik”.

In die naam van Suid-Afrika vra 'n onderskrywing van die apartheidsideologie van my as Christen om die grondwaarhede van my Christelike geloof pryse te gee. Liefde vir Suid-Afrika sou dan alleen betoon kon word in onvoorwaardelike steun vir die apartheidsideologie. Dit beteken dat ek moet leer om die Skrif so te interpreteer dat apartheid alleen as die goeie wil van God daarnit afgelees kan word en dat alles wat teen apartheid ingaan, „humanisties”, „liberalisties”, „ketter”, „ongereformeerde”, afkeer van Gods Woord is.

## BOSE IDEOLOGIE

Ek sou nooit ontdek het soe boos hierdie ideologie in sy wese is as hierdie offer nie van my gevra word in die naam van Suid-Afrika nie. Daarom is daar in 'n politieke verkiesing vir my so oneindig veel op die spel. My stem vir die Nasionale Party sou vir my neerkom op 'n verloëning van Christus, nee, meer nog: 'n Stem teen Christus. As ek daarom nog enige gevoel van vaderlandsliefde oorgehou het, durf ek my vaderland nie aan 'n vreemde heer help uitverkoop deur vir 'n party te stem wat die ideologie van apartheid as heilsvision aan die volk voorhou nie — en destoe minder waar anti-evangeliese elemente ten dienste van hierdie ideologie met 'n beroep op God as heilswaarhede verabsoluteer word.

Enkele reaksies op die Christelike Manifeste, waarvan dié van dr. Lee die tiperendste uitdrukking is van wat in die huidige politieke en geestelike klimaat in ons land as eg-Christelik beskou word, het my in hierdie oortuiging weer eens gesterk. Apartheid, veral ook soos vanuit kerklike kringe gesanksioneer, vra pertinent van my om te glo dat 'n konsekwente gedwonge skeiding van burgers van dieselfde land en 'n onregverdig diskri-

(Vervolg op bl. 11)



# MOEDSWILLIGE MISVERSTAND

BRUCKNER DE VILLIERS

## Nabetragting oor nog 'n Lunteren-Sinode

Met herinneringe aan die veelbewoë 1968-samekoms van die Gereformeerde Ekumeniese Sinode nog vars in afgevaardigdes se geheue, het daar so pas weer 'n belangrike kerkevergadering in die indrukwekkende vergadersentrum, De Blye Wereld, in die bosryke buitewyke van die rustige Nederlandse dorpje Lunteren, plaasgevind: die onlangse byeenkoms van die Generale Synode van die Gereformeerde Kerke in Nederland. Weer eens het 'n voelbare spanning opgelaa, veral tydens die bespreking van die omstrede rassekwessie. En weer eens is die uitslag van die besprekinge op bykans onverklaarbare wyse omhul in 'n waas van misverstand. Nederlandse en Suid-Afrikaanse vertolkings van wat daar tydens die onlangse Sinode-samekoms gebeur het en wat daar bereik is, verskil, soos in 1968 na die G.E.S., hemelsbreed van mekaar. En al gevolgtrekking waartoe 'n mens kan geraak, is dat, by alle broederlike welwillendheid en begrip vir mekaar se standpunte wat daar tussen Hollanders en Suid-Afrikaners bestaan het, hulle skynbaar weer eens by mekaar verbygepraat het en mekaar skromelik misverstaan het. Waar dit nou reeds by herhaling gebeur het, is die vermoede onontkombaar dat hierdie wedersydse misverstand nie slegs deur die merkwaardige omstandighede veroorsaak is nie, dog op meer as net 'n tikkie moeswilligheid — nie op 'n onvermoë nie, maar op 'n doelbewuste onwil om te verstaan — berus.

Die omstandighede was natuurlik, op hulself genome, dramaties genoeg.

Amptelik was dit 'n vergadering van die Generale Synode van die Nederlandse Gereformeerde Kerke — wat die Christelike Instituut van Suider-Afrika finansiële ondersteun en wie se amptelike deputate na die G.E.S. van 1968 hulle eenparig geskaar het agter die destydse sg. „Minderheidsrapport” van prof. J. Verkuyl e.a. (waarkragtens die Suid-Afrikaanse apartheidsbeleid, by name, as onbybels en onchristelik veroordeel is).

As amptelik uitgenodigde gaste uit Suid-Afrika was daar teenwoordig dr. J. S. Gericke, dr. J. D. Vorster en prof. F. J. M. Potgieter namens die invloedryke (blanke) Nederduitse Gereformeerde Kerk in Suid-Afrika (wat die Christelike Instituut in 1966 formeel verwerp het as „dwaalrigting”.) prof. W. J. Snijman namens die Gereformeerde Kerk van Suid-Afrika en ds. S. J. S. Ntoane, moderator van die Nederduitse Gereformeerde Kerk in Afrika (Bantoe).

Opvallend vir meer as een was die volslae afwesigheid van selfs 'n enkele verteenwoordiger van die N.G. Sendingkerk in Suid-Afrika (Kleurling) in wie se geleedere die apartheidsbeleid met sy gewraakte Groepsgebiedewet en Werkreserteringswet juis op die oomblik besig is om die ernstige onttras te veroorsaak. Was dit omdat geen afgevaardigde van die N.G. Sendingkerk werklik meer vertrou-

kon word om, in dié forum en voor sulke kritiese oë en ore, nog die „blye boodskap” van „eiesoortige ontwikkeling” te verkondig en te verdedig nie?

Want dáárom het die hele samekoms natuurlik gegaan: om 'n ondubbelzinnige veroordeling van apartheid enersyds en 'n verbete regverdiging en verdediging daarvan andersyds — ten spyte van dr. Gericke se stellige versekering aan die vergadering dat hy en sy medestanders daar teenwoordig was „nie as politici nie, maar as kerkmanne.”

### BELANGSTELLENDENES

Teenwoordig (was) ook 'n groot skaar Nederlandse toeskouers uit alle belangstellingsvelde, 'n goedgeorganiseerde groep Suid-Afrikaanse studente om steun te verleen aan die Suid-Afrikaanse afvaardiging, verteenwoordigers van aktivistiese Nederlandse jeuggroepe soos SyNOOD-kreet, Werkgroep Begeleiding GOS en Kairos, en ook, nie-amptelik, 'n enkele verteenwoordiger van die Christelike Instituut van Suider-Afrika, dienswillig die uwe.

As gas was, byna onopgemerk te midde van al die spanningsvolle wedersydse frontopstellinge, natuurlik ook teenwoordig ds. Jackson Phiri namens die N.G. Kerk in Zambië (Reformod Church in Zambia) wat, tydens 'n spesiale spreekbeurt aan hom toegestaan, 'n vurige oproep om

bestryding van die apartheidsideologie in Suid-Afrika gedoen het en wat met die grootste stelligheid bevoer het dat die Kerk van Christus hom móet inmeng in die rassepolitiek indien hy nog die sout van die aarde en die lig van die wêreld wil bly . . . .

Die vernaamste onderwerp ter bespreking — vandaar dan ook die buitengewone belangstelling deur buitestaanders en die krioelende koerant-, radio- en televisiemanne — was natuurlik, soos by die G.E.S. van 1968, die omstrede rassekwessie. Maar hierdie slag sou die aandag veral op die Suid-Afrikaanse rassesituasie toespits word. Vandaar die teenwoordigheid van die vername Suid-Afrikaanse gaste.

Aanleiding tot die hele debat was 'n uitvoerige verslag opgestel deur die destydse afvaardiging van die Nederlandse Gereformeerde Kerke na die G.E.S. van 1968. Ongelukkig word in dié verslag ook die breuk tussen die N.G. Kerk en die Christelike Instituut feitlik as onderafdeling van die rassekwessie behandel, sodat dit onvermydelik was dat ook die C.I. in die debat ter sprake sou kom. Hierdeur is die aandag gedeeltelik afgelenk van die sentrale probleem en het 'n element van kleinsieligheid ingesluip in die verrigtinge wat afbreuk gedoen het aan die origens hoogstaande peil van die hele bespreking.

### RASSEVRAAGSTUK

Wat die rassekwessie self betref, het die debat egter op heel voorspelbare wyse verloop. Een na die ander, soos 'n sombere prosesie lede van 'n Griekse tragediekoor, het die Nederlandse kerkmanne — Wouters, Mulder, Van den Berg, Van der Woude, Van der Veen, Verkuyl — op die been gekom om, eenparig en sonder uitsondering, hul bekommernis uit te spreek oor die situasie in Suid-Afrika en oor die Afrikaanse-Hollandse kerke se vreemde swye teen aansien van die onregte wat voortvloei uit die heersende Suid-Afrikaanse landsbeleid. Soos onbeispelende trommelslag, het die veroordeling van rasse-diskriminasie een na die ander opgeklink — allea natuur-



lik in 'n gees van opregte broederlikheid; maar tog onmisverstaanbaar duidelik, onomwonde, onverbiddelik.

Daar moes by die broeders uit Suid-Afrika geen twyfel meer gelaat word aangaande die universele afkeer in die Nederlandse Gereformeerde Kerke t.o.v. die Suid-Afrikaanse apartheidbeleid en sy gevolge nie. As daar al ooit sensuur (in sekulêre, nie-kerklike, sin) uitgespreek is, dan het Nederland dié môre sy sensuur oor Suid-Afrika uitgespreek; die kerk in Nederland oor veral die Afrikaans-Hollandse kerke in Suid-Afrika.

Dog ook die reaksie was voorspelbaar: 'n krampagtige en dikwels hartstogtelike verdediging van die Suid-Afrikaanse landsbeleid deur die afgevaardigdes uit Suid-Afrika, bleek en verwese na aanhoor van die felheid en die eenparigheid van die Nederlandse *faccuse*. Van hulle het prof. Snijman van die Geref. Kerk waarskynlik die beste indruk gemaak vanweë die waardigheid waarop hy sy saak gestel het en sy minstens verstaanbare behoudendheid en konserwatisme, wat veral weerklank gevind het by die afgevaardigde ouderlinge by die sinode, wat merendeels bejaarde pensioenarisse was.

Ds. Ntoane het gekom met 'n ietwat ongeloofwaardige versekering aan die sinode dat „sy mense” oor die algemeen heeltemal tevrede is met die apartheidbeleid, en met die ou argument — wat later geblyk het die enigste werklik nog sinvolle argument van die Suid-Afrikaanse afvaardiging te wees — dat die Suid-Afrikaanse rassesituasie veel meer geklompiseerd was as wat uit Nederlandse veralgemenings gekonkludeer kon word, dat daar veral tyd nodig was om die beleid van afsonderlike ontwikkeling tot volle ontplooiing te laat kom en dat die staat en die kerk in Suid-Afrika hierdie tyd gegun moes word deur Nederland en die Nederlandse Gereformeerde Kerke.

### APOLOGIA

Die lankverwagte *apologia* van die eintlike kampvegters vir die apartheidbeleid, tewens vir die amptelike standpunt van die invloedryke N.G. Kerk, was minder oortuigend. Toegee dat hulle, na die volgehoue veroordeling van die kant van die Nederlanders, na alle kante moes keer en op alle fronte moes verdedig, was die beste waartoe hulle in staat was 'n los en onsamehangende reeks teenargumente, wilde beweringe en onverantwoordelike beskuldiging, veral

wat betref die Christelike Instituut.

Dr. Vorster het beweer dat dit Nederland in sy bloeityd was wat apartheid by ons in Suid-Afrika ingevoer het, dat die C.I., volgens sy vreemde gegewens, besig was om geld wat ten behoeve van die Onafhanklike Bantoekekerke in Nederland ingesamel is, vir ander doeleindes te gebruik en dat die direkteur van die C.I. 'n immorele mens is omdat hy toelaat dat hy nog „dominee” genoem word. Dr. Gericke het indrukwekkende verwysings gemaak na wat daar alles vir die Bantoe in Suid-Afrika gedoen word en het met groot stelligheid beweer dat 72% van die totale begroting van die N.G. Kerk (sic) aan die Sending gewy word. Prof. Potgieter, die eintlike teoloog en nie-politikus, het, soos by die G.E.S., gekom met 'n lang betoog na aanleiding van die Toring van Babel en Hd. 17:26 om uit die Skrif te bewys dat die „pluriformiteitsbeginsel” die enigste gesonde grondslag vir die menslike samelewing is — 'n uitgediende apartheidsteologie wat menige Nederlandse teoloog binnensmonds dog hoorbaar laat mompel het van misnoeë.

En so het dit die hele lange dag lank voortgegaan tot laat in die aand. 'n Hele aantal sinodegangers wat ook nog 'n stuiwer in die armbeurs wou werp, kon geen spreekgeleentheid vind nie: die saak moes afgehandel word.

Dr. Gericke en ds. Ntoane het vir 'n tweede maal gepraat. So ook dr. Vorster, met 'n vurige aanval op die Christelike Instituut — 'n aanval gegrond op „gegewens” wat onder sy aandag gebring is, dog wat nooit bevestig is deur die amptelike inligtingsdiens van die C.I. nie.

### CHRISTELIKE INSTTUUT

Juis omdat sy insinuasies en beskuldigings so fel was, is ek — na heelwat misverstand vooraf, dog uiteindelik met verlof van die Suid-Afrikaanse „gaste” — die geleentheid gegun om, namens die C.I., die sinode toe te spreek. Ek het dr. Vorster sy oningeligheid op essensiële punte verwyt, 'n paar wanvoorstellings reggestel, dog daarna afgestap van die C.I.-kwessie en 'n beeld probeer skilder van die dilemma waarin die N.G. Kerk, my kerk, hom bevind. Ek het o.a. beweer dat die Koninkryk van God in Suid-Afrika in 'n krisis verkeer.

Hieroor het dr. Vorster hom vererg en in sy repliek op my toespraak „onder provokasie” beweer

dat die Koninkryk van God nouliks ten beste gedien word deur manne soos Beyers Naudé en Bruckner de Villiers. Vandaar het die debat gedaal tot die peil van persoonlikhede en persoonlike verdagmakinge, 'n *argumentum ad hominem*.

Onsteltenis, verbystering en verslaenheid onder die sinodegangers. Die diplomatiëse moderator van die Sinode, dr. P. G. Kunst, verdaag die vergadering tydelik met 'n gebed om broederlike begrip uit die stoel. Eersteklas drama.

Konsternasie tydens die pouse. Manne wat ek nog glad nie ontmoet het nie — ook Suid-Afrikaanse studente — kom betuig hulle spyt teenoor my oor wat so pas gebeur het. Ook dr. Gericke, wat my verseker dat hy persoonlik al hoëveel toenaderingspogings tot die direkteur van die C.I., ds. Naudé, gemaak het. Vir my is dit heeltemal iets nuuts.

Groot onderlinge bewoënhed. Ek troos hom daarmee dat daar tog 'n baba uit die barensnood gebore mag word. Het ek sy verlof om 'n rondetafel-byeenkoms tussen verteenwoordigers van die C.I. en die N.G. Kerk te reël? Nie alleen sy verlof nie: hy versoek my daartoe.

Koerantmanne onmiddellik by: wat het gebeur, wat het gebeur? Die volgende dag, 'n berig in die dagblad *Trouw*: „Dr. Gericke nodigde dr. Bruckner de Villiers selfs uit om een ontmoeting te organiseren tussen vooraanstaande mense uit het Christelike Instituut en die Nederduits Gereformeerde Kerk”, en die dag daarna: „Maar selfs uit die pijnlike bespreking van het Christelike Instituut is iets goeds geboren, in zoverre dat het wil voorkomen dat nu de weg is geopend voor een gesprek tussen het Chr. Instituut en de leiders van die N.G. Kerk”. Van hierdie berigte neem alle sinodegangers, asook die afgevaardigdes uit Suid-Afrika, kennis.

Daarna sou dié berigte, volgens Suid-Afrikaanse koerantverslae, ontken word, by name deur dr. Gericke. En daarmee is dan ook — voorlopig altans — een van die belangrikste vrugte van die sinode tot niet en was al die, dikwels hoogs emosionele, gedoe skynbaar tevergeefs.

### AMPTELIKE BESLUIT

Maar terug na die sinodegebeure. Na die reses het dr. Vorster voor die Sinode verskoning aangebied vir die wyse waarop hy hom vantevore tydens die debat te buite gegaan het.

(Vervolg op bladsy 17)



# VERMANING UIT NEDERLAND

Die amptelike brief <sup>1)</sup> van die Generale Synode van die Nederlandse Gereformeerde Kerke aan die Suid-Afrikaanse Kerke met wie hulle skakel:

„Die Generale Sinode van die Gereformeerde Kerke in Nederland het tydens sy sittingsperiode van Maart 1970 die afgevaardigdes van u kerk ontvang en met hulle in kleiner en groter kring gesprek oor die sake wat u kerke en ons s'n daartoe gedring het om mekaar te ontmoet en broederlik aan te spreek.

„In die volle bewussyn van ons verbondenheid met u kerke in Suid-Afrika het ons ons geroepe beskou om ons tot u te wend met betrekking tot die verhouding van die rasse in u land.

„Omdat die Generale Sinode wil bly uitgaan van die goeie trou waarmee u in die lig van die Heilige Skrif 'n oplossing wil soek vir die veelvuldige probleme van die rassesituasie in u land, kom ons met vrymoedigheid tot u met die stelling dat die Heilige Skrif na ons oortuiging van die kerk 'n ander houding eis ten opsigte van die rasseproblematiek dan dié wat ons in die besluite en die praktyk van u kerke meen te verneem.

„Die Generale Sinode het die verwagting uitgespreek dat die besluite van die Gereformeerde Ekumeniese Sinode insake die rasseverhoudinge ook deur u sal aanvaar en volgens die bedoeling van hierdie besluite sal toepas word.

„Ons verbondenheid in Christus met u kerke gee ons die vrymoedigheid om aan u te skryf en te pleit vir 'n sodanige bestudering en beluistering van die Heilige Skrif dat gewaak word teen elke dirigerende invloed wat sosiale, politieke en ander omstandighede op u en ons denke wil uitoefen. Ons wil u vra of die strewen na selfbehoud en die verdediging van die eie bevoorregte posisie ten koste van medemenses met die eise van die Heilige Skrif en die sosiale geregtigheid wat daarin gebied word, gerym kan word. Die Generale Synode spreek die

hoop uit dat u in die lewe van kerk, staat en maatskappy die konsekwensies van dié geregtigheid blymoedig en in vertroue op Gods belofte sal trek.

„Die Generale Sinode het dit hoog op prys gestel dat u afgevaardigdes tot ons oorgekom het om deur 'n ontmoeting sonder voorbehoude goeie bande van gemeenskap te soek en weer te bevestig. Hy vertrou dat hierdie eerste ontmoeting nie verlore mag gaan nie maar in volgende besprekinge bewaar en versterk sal word.

„Soos ons geluister het na u vermaning tot ons gerig in verband met vrae insake Skrif en belydenis, so kom ons tot u met die boodskap wat in hierdie brief vervat is. Ons hoop dat die krag daarvan nie alleen sal bly deurwerk in die gemeenskap tussen u en ons kerke nie, maar ook in u eie kring bekendgemaak en gesoek sal word. In gesprekke op ons Sinode het ons gehoor en in ons hart bewaar dat u afgevaardigdes verklaar het dat hulle die deur ope hou vir die gesprek met die Christelike Instituut. Omdat hy geweldige baie in ons land die begeerte leef dat die brug van u kerke na die werk van hierdie broeders geslaan en begaanbaar gemaak word, bring die sinode hierdie verlange met vrymoedigheid tot u oor.

„Wees verseker van die opregte gesindheid waarin hierdie brief namens die Generale Sinode aan u kerkvergadering en aan die lede van u kerke geskryf is, net soos ons nie sal nalat om u broederlike raad in ag te neem nie.

„Die God van alle genade seën u en u kerke by die lees en oorweging van hierdie boodskap wat ons, gedronge deur die liefde van Christus wat verbind, aan u stuur.”

<sup>1)</sup> Vertaal uit die Nederlands. Kuntvering van die vertaler.



# Fools or Angels? . . . . . Danie van Zyl

The African Independent Churches still await their own chronicler to select and piece together the great and decisive moments in their history. What is known about them to-day has been written up mostly by white men, men with sympathy and a deep understanding of the African mind and heart. Yet, the mark of the White man's approach is unmistakable: facts, figures, analyses of problems and problem areas. Often the African Independent Churches have formed a useful field for research for an academic degree. All this is good and commendable, yet it bears the mark of the outsider. And so this article, too, must inevitably bear the same mark.

The African Independent Churches as a movement dates back to the last decade of the nineteenth century. Since then the numerical growth of the movement both in terms of churches and members has been impressive. At the last census, 22% of the African population belonged to approximately 2000 Independent Churches.

This growth took place in spite of some severe disadvantages and problems. (Although some disadvantages may turn out to be their present strong points).

## DISADVANTAGES

The African Independent Churches have in the main functioned in isolation from the mission churches, and have attracted the poorer people as members. These churches had to make do without the financial aid or backing of a mother church or mission society and without the wealthier members of African Society.

A second disadvantage was that the majority of churches failed to qualify as recognised churches. This usually meant that the church could have no marriage officers, its ministers could not qualify for Railway Concessions and it could get no sites in urban areas for the erection of church buildings.

A third disadvantage was the continual fragmentation of the churches. This fragmentation was due to various factors, among them leadership disputes, mismanagement of church funds, maladministration, and lack of self-discipline.

A fourth disadvantage was the inability of most churches to found and finance training centres for future ministers. Some churches made use of the training facilities of smaller missionary churches, often of Pentecostal persuasion. In view of subsequent statements in this article that mission churches were in the main unconcerned about the Independent Church movement, I would like to say that many churches have benefited greatly from the service rendered by these training institutions

who have been willing to open their doors to ministers of the Independent Churches. Yet these institutions alone failed to meet adequately the need of the African Independent Churches as a whole. We can say that most ministers in the Independent Churches have had no formal theological, biblical or pastoral training at all, while many of them have had very little formal education of any kind.

A fifth disadvantage has been the isolation in which the churches have had to work. Missionary churches have tended to regard the Independent Churches as syncretistic and sub-Christian. Most mission churches give very little attention to the Independent Churches, and where attention was given at all, it was because the Independent Churches were regarded as dangerous competitors hampering the proclamation of the true and pure gospel. There are some noteworthy exceptions, namely the Anglican Church which has nurtured the Order of Ethiopia in its bosom, and the Interdenominational African Ministers Association of S.A. (IDAMASA, formerly TIAMA) in which individual Independent Church ministers can have fellowship with their black fellow ministers.

## EDUCATION

Leaders of the Independent Churches have been aware of their own problems, but have not always been able to find ways and means of solving them. One particular barrier seemed to be the matter of education. Whenever application was made for Church recognition (until 1966 when church recognition was abolished), or when ministers apply for marriage officer's licences, or when churches apply for sites, the same question appears: "What theological education has the minister had?" and "What facilities for theological training does the Church offer?"

Sending men to Bible Schools run by Mission groups did not always meet the church's need. Too often men never returned to a small, fin-

ancially insecure, Independent Church, but joined the church sponsoring the Bible School. At other times young men came home to challenge the Bishop for leadership of the group. A Bishop so challenged was not likely to send another bright young man to receive "education".

When the Rev. C. F. B. Naudé of the Christian Institute was faced with a delegation of church leaders in 1964 requesting help from the Christian Institute, some answer had to be given. The Christian Institute surveyed the field in vain to find an existing body, or group of churches to whom these leaders could be referred. Finally the Christian Institute accepted the responsibility of seeking financial aid to enable these leaders to investigate the needs of the churches and if necessary to form themselves into an association. Such an Association was to attempt to meet the existing needs of the Churches, and in particular the need for theological training. The association formed in June 1965 was called the African Independent Churches' Association, commonly known as AICA.

Since that time the work has progressed, but not without its own problems. During this period the Christian Institute also had to face the onslaught of the mighty Dutch Reformed Church. In the Johannesburg area members of the Christian Institute who were also members of the N.G. Kerk, had to face charges brought against them. And Ds. Nico van Loggerenberg, in particular, played an important part in pressing charges against them.

It was with some surprise that I read in the Transvaler of the 16th March, 1970 that a group of Independent Churches had decided to "break away from the Christian Institute" and that, with the help of Ds. Nico van Loggerenberg, this group would start its own Independent Church organisation. It seems that "break away from the Christian Institute" is to be read as "dissociating from the help given by the Christian Institute", as no church can

(Continued on page 15)



# Development In Development — MARK COLLIER

The March issue of the *South African Outlook* has devoted most of its space to the very important World Consultation on Ecumenical Assistance for Development Projects organised by the World Council of Churches and held in Montreux, Switzerland. This consultation is only one in a developing concern of churches for development and is one in which the churches understanding of development has shown a marked development.

The accelerating concern of the churches has been clearest in the last decade, known as the Development Decade. First Pope John's two social encyclicals: *Mater et Magistra* and *Pacem in Terris*; then the important Church and Society Conference of the World Council of Churches in Geneva in 1966; the erection of the Commission for Justice and Peace by Pope Paul in 1967 followed by his encyclical *Progressio populorum*; the erection of the joint WCC/RC Committee on Society, Development and Peace (SODEPAX) and its Conference on World Co-operation for Development held in Beirut in 1968; then the fourth Assembly of the World Council of Churches in Uppsala in 1968; followed by the Consultation by the Secretariat for Development Education of WCC in Geneva in 1969; SODEPAX's Conference on the Challenge of Development in Montreal in 1969; and now the World Council's Consultation in Montreux in 1970.

In South Africa we have a policy of separate development. The policy is no development unless separate, but as Lady Jackson, the British economist observed when she was here last year there should be more development and less separation. Still the word 'development' is almost in our title deeds. It may be well to look at what the word means by these international organs, discover why it is regarded as important and what we can learn from the discussions.

## WHAT THE WORD MEANS

It took the economic crisis of 1928-1932 to make the dominant industrialised countries first to realise that their economies were closely intertwined with the less-industrialised countries and that the absence of development in these countries was inevitably detrimental to their own expansion. This lack of industrialisation and modernisation soon became the concern of economists.

With the emergence of the Third World on the world-scene they all too easily became labelled as the underdeveloped or developing nations as opposed to the developed

nations of Europe and North America. Here a developed country was seen as one with a high Gross National Product and a developing country one with a low Gross National Product. Development aid was that quality of aid that would assist the developing country to improve and maintain a viable economic growth rate.

But already thinking was changing and groups like the *Economie et Humanisme* group in France were dissatisfied with economic growth being the measurement for development. Their concern was with man's development as well. Hence not only to have more, but to be more.

## Beirut

Then came the realisation that the Development Decade had not realised expectations. The Beirut conference stated: "from a Christian perspective, the underlying purpose of development is to free man for the fuller use of his God-given creative powers. Such development aims at higher levels of consumption, both material and cultural, more evenly distributed, and at a continuing further rise, eventually sustainable on the basis of a country's own savings. It requires attitudes of efficiency and openness to social and technical innovation, a more efficient agriculture and growth in manufacturing industries and services. It aims at expansion of education and cultural activities, needed for full human development as well as for economic expansion. It is accompanied by social integration, reducing class and other barriers. It spreads opportunities for a fuller life to more and more of the people, especially in rural areas."

## Montreal

Montreal took it a step further and put the debate into a context of rich/poor or powerful/powerless. Because humanisation and liberation is the purpose of development it saw a necessary confrontation of the powerful by the powerless since the latter are still being dominated by the former. But seeing that liberty is the purpose of liberation the conference

saw a necessary confrontation of both by the insights of the Gospel's commitment for a more just and human order. Aid was therefore to help further the concept of a worldwide community and collective responsibility for development.

## Montreux

At Montreux this development was again confirmed largely as a result of the remarkable contribution of Professor S. L. Parmar, reader in economics at Allahabad University, India. In February this year the Executive Committee of the W.C.C. defined development as the process by which both persons and societies come to realise the full potential of human life in a context of social justice, with an emphasis on self-reliance; economic growth being seen as one of the means for carrying forward this process.

It follows that if social as well as economic criteria are employed, in the understanding of development, then all countries are underdeveloped, because even the most affluent countries have the poor, the unemployed, pollution in the cities and the like. And because there is a mutuality in the process of development and an inter-dependence between nations the whole world is underdeveloped. Consequently development is the vocation of all and a transformation is required in all political, ideological, social and economic systems.

Montreux saw social justice as the essential context for development within the interdependence and solidarity of the human family. "This concept of social justice," wrote Professor Parmar, "is not based on enlightened self-interest of dominant groups, but on the basic right of all people to equality and human dignity."

## WHY DEVELOPMENT?

Christian theology is divided in its understanding of a theology of development because it is divided in its understanding of a theology of the world. It is divided in its understanding of a theology of the world be-

(Continued on page 14)



(*Vervolg van bladsy 2*)

dit is ook besig om die Afrikaanse Kerke stadig maar seker te dwing om met 'n groter eerlikheid en openheid as wat tot dusver die geval was, verantwoording te doen oor die Christen se standpunt t.o.v. ons huidige beleid van apartheid (of selfstandige ontwikkeling). Want in sy wese gaan die hele geskil tussen Vorster en Hertzog oor die rassevraagstuk en die Afrikaner se houding daarteenoor en hoewel die oorgrote meerderheid van Afrikaanse Kerklidmate wat Nasionaal-gesind is (N.P. sowel as H.N.P.) dit miskien nog nie beseef nie, is God besig om in hierdie tyd ons hele Afrikanervolk te toets aan hierdie een maatstaf: hoe verantwoord jy jou politieke sienswyse oor apartheid in die lig van die Skrif?

Tot dusver het die N.G. Kerk dit nog ontwyk om enige duidelike antwoord op die vraag te gee. Sewentig kerkleiers, teoloë, geestelikes en Christenlidmate het onlangs hulle antwoord gebied in die Christelike Verkiesingsmanifes — 'n manifest wat summier en met verwagting verwerp is deur leiers van die N.G. Kerk. Maar God slaap nie: wat hierdie manne weier om as Christelike uitdaging en vermaning te aanvaar omdat dit dan sogenaamd van „links” kom, gaan een van die dae — baie gou — as uitdaging en onontwykbare toets van „regs” kom. Die N.H. Kerk het in hierdie stryd om rasse-geregtigheid al lankal gekies — en deur sy keuse die pad vir die stigting van die Herstigte Nasionale Party voorberei. Die N.G. Kerk hink nog op twee gedagtes omdat in sy boesem die twee botsende sienswyses nog albei geherberg en verberg word. Daarvan is een van die beste bewyse die feit dat twee opeenvolgende redakteurs van *Die Kerkbode* die een na regs (Dr. A. P. Treurnicht na *Hoofstad*) en die ander na die verste regs (Dr. W. Lubbe na *Die Afrikaner*) beweeg het. Albei beroep hulle op hulle Calvinistiese egtheid en gereformeerdheid ter stawing en ondersteuning van hulle politieke sieninge. Tussen hierdie twee sieninge sal die N.G. Kerk vroeër of later moet kies. Tussen hierdie twee sieninge word die lidmate van die Afrikaanse Kerke wat kiesers is, gevra of gedwing om op 22 April te kies. As die Afrikaanse Kerke getrou was in onvoordelige gehoorsaamheid aan die lig van Gods Woord, sou hulle hulle lidmate moes opgeroep het om by albei hierdie valse aansprake van „eg Calvinistiese en ge-

(*Vervolg op bladsy 11*)

# A Crisis of Conscience

## Rhodesian Bishops

In June last year, before the Rhodesian Referendum, Church leaders addressed a message and appeal to the Christian people of Rhodesia in which they said: "The Christian faith involves a concern for every human relationship. This includes the relationship created by life together within one political body under one government. We cannot therefore agree with those who say that Christianity has nothing to do with politics. A country which professes to uphold and defend Christian principles must always be willing to let its political life be examined and judged in the light of God's will."

In the same month the five Catholic Bishops of Rhodesia also issued a pastoral message entitled "A Call to Christians". The Bishops issued on 17th March another urgent pastoral message which we print in full. The situation in Rhodesia is so similar to that of South Africa that we think it a message equally applicable to us in South Africa as we face a general election and a similar crisis of conscience.

Before the Referendum last June, we spoke to you in a brief Pastoral Message entitled, "A Call to Christians", about possible dangers to the Church and her mission, contained in the proposals for a new Constitution for Rhodesia. Our worst fears seem now to have been realised; laws have been passed which have precipitated a most serious crisis for the Church in this country. <sup>1</sup> Further legislation of a similar character is contemplated. <sup>2</sup> It is our duty to inform you of this crisis, to tell you how you are or may be involved in it, and to ask you for your assistance in averting the dangers consequent on it.

The crisis we speak of is a matter of concern for all Christians. It is in a special sense the affair of the laity, "fellow-workers for the truth" (3 John 8), who have the duty to penetrate and perfect with the spirit of the Gospel the world in which they live. <sup>3</sup>

What has happened is this: new legislation is bringing to a close the honourable and fruitful tradition of understanding and co-operation which has hitherto existed between Church and State in Rhodesia. Henceforth, the Church shall merely be tolerated and may be permitted to exercise her mission only within such limits as Government Ministers see fit to determine. <sup>4</sup> The liberty of the Church to move freely among the people has been set aside in principle, and the missionary who is sent to teach all nations may henceforth exercise his apostolic function on sufferance only, where and when and for as long as he is issued by the State with a permit to do so. <sup>5</sup>

The right to freedom of association for the purpose of worship of Almighty God according to one's conscience has, as a principle, also been set aside, and people of one race or colour may be forbidden to frequent the churches of their faith outside their own prescribed racial areas. <sup>6</sup> It may well be that we shall also be denied, in violation of our conscience, the right to educate in our schools whomsoever we will. We may even be forced by regulation to refuse hospital beds to anyone not of the race approved in that area. <sup>7</sup> Priests and nuns and teaching brothers may have to be segregated in their communities according to their racial origins. <sup>8</sup> The whole future of the Church in Rhodesia is thus at stake.

This is your problem as well as ours; your conscience ought to be as much burdened as our own; your obligation to confess Christ before men as clear-cut as your bishops'. As Christians, none of us can be indifferent; we cannot accept all this and say or do nothing in reply. When the first apostles were commanded by the civil authority to be silent and no longer to preach and teach in the name of Jesus, they had in conscience to answer: "We must obey God rather than men" (Acts 5, 29). We, your Bishops, cannot do other than they: for your part neither can you. Discriminatory laws have now been enacted which are



contrary to Christian faith. This we cannot accept. They touch the very central teaching of our faith, the Incarnation. Our Divine Lord in becoming man bound the whole human race to Himself as a family through a supernatural solidarity, and chose to identify Himself with men that He takes as done to Himself, in hurt or in love, whatever we do to our fellow-men, even the least.

For this reason, "the ground is removed from any theory or practice which leads to a distinction between men or peoples in the matter of human dignity and the rights which flow from it. Consequently, the Church rejects as foreign to the mind of Christ any discrimination against men or harassment of them because of their race, colour, condition of life or religion." \* This is the teaching of the Church, assembled in the Second Vatican Council. This is what conscience compels us to practise.

Let us make our position absolutely clear: When we speak of the Church's mission to permeate and elevate society, there is no question of our entering into the field of politics. This is not our intention. What we are saying is that the whole community is to be renewed through Christ's command of love, "which is the basic law of human perfection and hence of the world's transformation." 10

The Church is not committed to any particular form of government or to any political party. Her greatest desire is that in her mission of service and reconciliation, in pursuit of the welfare of all, she may be able to develop herself freely under any kind of government, which grants recognition to the basic rights of person and family, and to the demands of the common good. 11

This fundamental freedom is now endangered. Our liberty to perform our mission of service to all sections of the community and to carry out our work of reconciliation has been grievously restricted. Like the first apostles, we are now compelled to declare: "We must obey God rather than men." (Acts 5,29). We cannot in conscience and will not in practice accept any limitation of our freedom to deal with all people, irrespective of race, as members of the one human family, as our brothers in Christ, and in the spirit demanded by Him who said: "By this shall all men know that you are my disciples, if you have love for one another" (John 13, 35).

1 Constitution Act, No. 54 of 1969; Land Tenure Act, No. 55 of 1969.

2 Property Owners' Bill.

3 Second Vatican Council: Decree on the Apostolate of the Laity, paragraph 5.

4 Land Tenure Act No. 55 of 1969: sections 11, 24 and 72.

5 Ibidem: sections 11, 15, 17, 19, 20, 22, 24, 29, 31, 33, 34 and 36.

6 Ibidem: sections 3, 11, 34 and 38.

7 Ibidem: sections 17, 19, 31 and 33.

8 Ibidem: sections 11, 15, 17, 19, 20, 24, 29, 31, 33 and 34.

9 Second Vatican Council, Declaration on the Relationship of the Church to Non-Christian Religions, paragraph 5.

10 Second Vatican Council, Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the Modern World, paragraph 38.

11 Ibidem: Paragraph 42.

(Vervolg van bladsy 10)

reformeerde" politieke standpunte verby te stap en hulle steun te gee aan die eg Bybelse standpunte van die Christelike Verkiesingsmanifes. Maar omdat hulle dit nie doen nie, gaan duisende lidmate van alle kerke in Suid-Afrika die verkiesing tegevoet met 'n verdeelde gees, 'n verwarde gemoed, en 'n verdwaalde gevoel wat net tot skade kan strek van Gods Koninkryk. En voordat ons nie onbevrees die Bybelse standpunt oor Kerk en staat, Christen en politiek verkondig en bevestig deur woord en daad nie, sal die verwarring toeneem,

die verdeeldheid vererger — en word so die grond voorberei vir 'n totalitêre gesagstaat waarin die blanke se politieke regte ernstig bedreig gaan word en die nie-blanke se verontregte posisie nog verder vererger gaan word. Daarom die dringende, ernstige beroep op elke Christen wat as kieser op 22 April na die stembus gaan: laat u stem nie net 'n stem van protes wees teen alle rasse-onreg en diskriminasie op grond van kleur nie, maar ook 'n profetiese stem wat die pad aandui na 'n samelewingsvorm waarin daar gelyke geleenthede gebied word aan alle inwoners van Suid-Afrika.

(Vervolg van bl. 4)

minasie tussen hulle in die arbitrêre erkenning van regte op grond van kleur, ras, godsdiens of geslag alleen, goed en volgens die wil van God is — al moet God self in sy laaste oordeel dan ook dien as voorbeeld van hoe daar in ons landspolitek gediskrimineer moet word; dit vra pertinent van my om my oë te sluit vir wat klaar soos die daglig is, nl. dat 'n politiek van rasse-apartheid, om van „regverdige rasse-apartheid" nie eens te praat nie, in ons land prakties onuitvoerbaar is; dit vra pertinent van my om as goed te aanvaar dat die waardigheid van vele landsburgers vanweë die pogings om hierdie beleid in die praktyk toe te pas, aange-tas, gekrenk en geskaad word; dit vra pertinent van my om te glo dat daar 'n bybelse gebod van selfliede is wat groepsselfsug en die eensydige bevordering van seksionele belange in die politiek 'n goddelike vereiste maak. Met een woord: dit vra pertinent van my om te glo in 'n evangelie wat geen evangelie is nie, wat die evangelie van Christus op basiese punte presies in sy teendeel omkeer.

**Hoe enige Christen tot so 'n offer bereid kan wees, is vir my nie duidelik nie. Ek beslis nie, al moet ek my „gereformeerde" vir goed teen hierdie weiering inruil. Dan staan ek nog liever as 'n „heiden" bekend. Want liever 'n „apartheidshaiden" met Christus as 'n „gereformeerde" apartheidsgelowige sonder Christus.**

Maar dan rus daar nog op die ongereformeerde apartheidshaidene 'n dure verpligting. Die liefde vir Christus en vir ons landgenote eis dit van ons. Die opstellers van die Christelike Verkiesingsmanifes het iets van hierdie verpligting probeer uitvoer. Ons kan ten minste darem nog ons getuienis laat hoor. Minder as dit mag ons nie doen nie. U, leser, is dit aan u mede-kieser verskuldig om hom te herinner aan wat vanjaar weer in werklikheid van hom by die stembus verwag word, aan wat die keuse in werklikheid is waarvoor hy gestel word. Hierdie verkiesingsmanifes was 'n poging om u daarin behulpsaam te wees en u kan self daarvan gebruik maak om mede-Christene, tot wie dit nog nie deurgedring het waarvoor dit werklik gaan nie, se oë daarvoor te probeer oopmaak. Met die brief van dr. Lee aan *Die Kerkbode* van 11 Maart 1970, kan u dit illustreer.



# DISREGARDED PEOPLE — A REVIEW

— NADINE GORDIMER and DAVE ADLER

For some years and particularly recently there have been disturbing reports about the removal and resettlement of Africans in the name of Apartheid; particularly so-called "Black Spots" removals. Glimpses of arbitrary expropriation, confusion, discomfort, inadequate facilities, official callousness, starvation and insufficient avenues of employment have come through in reports on places such as Charlestown, Limehill, Stinkwater, Morsgat and Kuruman.

It has been officially announced that such removals were taking place, indeed the government regularly announces with pride that Apartheid is succeeding and that "Black Spots" are rapidly disappearing. Consequently the question arose of how such removal was taking place and under what conditions, and to what places people are moved, and the conditions there.

Father Cosmas Desmond, one of those who were involved in the exposure of the Limehill removal, decided to find out. After travelling over 20,000 miles and speaking to hundreds of people he has produced a startling book describing many removals. And, he suspects, there are many more.

The contents of the book, entitled "Discarded People", are stunning in their description of removals and the indifferent, often callous, conditions under which people are removed. The book is sometimes difficult to read; sometimes because of the shock of actually reading of an incident or removal, but also because of necessary repetition. As each removal is described, the same wearying, dreary and upsetting picture emerges — a huge chess game, with 15 million Africans made pawns.

If the book makes the reader question the morality of apartheid and shudder at the inhumanities practised in its name, does it not force the reader to consider how much more inhuman the players of apartheid are made by the game? It also, by down-to-earth comment, exposes the myth of apartheid in that there is obviously no provision of "equality" in its application. Two emerging facts are of special interest.

First, that Africans suffer restriction in their own "homelands" as they do in "White Areas". Their movement is curtailed, as are their rights to freedom of speech and land ownership.

Secondly, that resettlement of these people has resulted in their by and large being situated further from sources of employment, and therefore more Africans are becoming migrant labourers, and being forced into the migrant labour system, which has been roundly condemned.

Father Desmond makes no large claims for his book. Although he does quote from reliable official sources it is simply an account of what he has seen. He explains that an approach was made to the Bantu Affairs Department so that a proper study could be made, and that permission was first granted conditionally (in that all material was to be submitted to the Department before publication) and subsequently even this permission was withdrawn. It goes without saying that for the truth of the contents of Father Desmond's book to be effectively repudiated, the government must allow independent and free scientific investigation to take place.

Father Desmond has pioneered the way to a greater concern for those affected by this aspect of the Apartheid master plan. It is encouraging to see churchmen taking an active role in this, but the book begs the question of what future action is to be taken.

So that you may gain more of an idea of the book, the Preface to it, written by Nadine Gordimer, is here reproduced in full.

Father Cosmas Desmond questioned whether he was the best qualified person to undertake the research for and write this book, and I began by asking myself whether I was in any way qualified to write a foreword to it. We were both wrong; as citizens of South Africa the subject is our responsibility, and as human beings it is our concern. If, reading his book, you question your right and responsibility to judge the facts set out before you, remember that the same applies to you.

You know well enough to eat when you're hungry, don't you? To close the doors and turn on the heater when you're cold? To choose a place to live at a rent you can afford, on a transport route convenient to your

interests? — That is all the expertise needed to judge the reasonable needs of any fellow human being. Forget about his colour or "what he was used to"; he hungers, thirsts, and must work for his living just as you do. It is too easy for us to shelter behind the analyses of the behavioural sciences, that serves to rationalise the Americans "hamlet" system in Viet Nam as the "restructuring of society rather than the waging of war, and the crypto-behavioural theory of apartheid that rationalises arbitrary resettlement in South Africa on the premise that affinity of skin colour and race overrides all other human needs. Our separate development planners have explained at length *why* communities are

moved. This book sets out dispassionately to give that information; after reading it, I do not think there could be any reader who does not find himself turning back to the planners with his own question, asking why — *why* should people have to live like this in a prosperous country at peace? Is there any aim or gain that could be worth it?

## THE DESIGN — GRAND?

Yet whatever else the separate development resettlement scheme lacks — and what a forlorn and deserted reality, recorded in the pages that follow, is the substance of that high-sounding concept — it does not lack apologists. These are not only people



committed to the Grand Design of apartheid, but also those avowed to White Leadership with Justice, and even some who think of themselves as the new Hard-edge liberals as distinct from those who obsoletely refuse to bring their focus down to enlightened self-interest. The Grand Design apologists' argument requires an act of faith that, once one has read this book if never before, becomes a blasphemy — no human being can believe that it could be God's will that the white man's way of life be secured apart at the price of these Morsgats, Mnxeshas and Weenens. Other apologists base themselves on secular ground, and in the case of the Hard-edge liberals, are more and more inclined to invoke historical and even a-political precedents for the uprooting of communities. Dodging about among the centuries and countries it is true that one may prove that South Africa is not the only or the first country in the world to lift people out of their homes and jobs and dump them elsewhere. I have heard quoted as roughly analogous to the South African practice, the treatment of Irish labourers in England in the 19th Century, and contemporary attempts to resettle depopulated areas in Southern Italy.

### EAST OF HOMELANDS

In particular, the term *decentralisation* has a sober ring of necessity and impartiality about it; but it simply cannot be invoked with honesty or accuracy to define a policy of removals first and last by the colour of the communities in question rather than their density. Its logic falls down completely when the community is moved from a place where people had employment to another where no employment exists. If precedents of one kind and another will serve to justify the deliberate bringing about of conditions of life described in Father Desmond's account, I offer one of my own: "... Families were ordered to move just before the sowing season, making it impossible for them to plant any seeds that year, while others were ordered to move just before the harvest. Many farm houses seem to have been destroyed before preparations had been made for the farmers' relocation. . . . We issue small subsidy funds and severe orders telling them to move to a designated location by such and such a date and that this is the last order. But it is too miserable to watch the farmers

destroying their accustomed houses, and to see innocent babies wrapped in rags and smiling on carts that are carrying the household goods away. A few days ago a girl of sixteen or seventeen made me weep by coming to my office . . . and kneeling down to beg me to spare her house. She said, 'Do we really have to tear down our house . . . ?' She had walked a long way to town, thinking, 'If I asked the councillor, something could be done.' Watching the bony back of the little girl who was quietly led out by the office boy, I closed my eyes and told myself, "You will go to hell." . . . The programme was forced through mercilessly, inhumanely, without emotion. . . . these hamlets were built with . . . tears and sweat."

A Bantu Affairs Department official speaking? A Father Desmond? A missionary? Some compassionate person distributing blankets and medicine to a Limehill? None of these. The passage comes from the Secret Report of the Office of Information of the Government of Manchuokuo, April 1939, and the official in charge of removals who told himself "You will go to hell" was a Japanese.

### MANIPULATING THE POWERLESS

Yes, it has been done before, if perhaps never on the same scale, and certainly never for the sole reason of putting a distance between people of one skin colour and another. But what does precedence prove? That in the second richest country in Africa, in the seventh decade of the 20th Century, choosing to manipulate the lives of a voteless and powerless indigenous majority in accordance with a theory of colour preference, we are reproducing the living conditions of 19th Century European famine victims allowed to labour under sufferance in another country; the conditions of an indigenous Far Eastern population under foreign invaders thirty years ago? That in a world with a vast refugee problem still unsolved from the last world war and the lesser ones that have succeeded it, we, who have never suffered the destruction of our own soil and cities, have created encampments of people living like the homeless refugees of Palestine, Biafra and Viet Nam.

I do not understand the comfort and release from guilt to be found in

putting other peoples' sufferings — those of our fellow South Africans, and others, even further out of sight — on the scale and finding a balance. For all white South Africans — from the Grand Design apologists, in whatever order you think just, down through the upholders of White Leadership with Justice, the Hard- and Soft-edge liberals, the label-less mass, and certainly not excluding myself and not even excluding Father Desmond and the groups of churchmen and private citizens who have done so much to bring succour to the victims of resettlement — it is surely only possible to say of these victims: "It is enough that they show us what we have made of them for us to realise what we have made of ourselves." (Jean-Paul Sartre).

### BREAD AND LATRINE ISSUE

The physical conditions of life described in this book are such an appalling desolation that one is almost unable to think beyond bread and latrines. That is to say, the sense of urgency one feels on behalf of people whose struggle for existence has been reduced to a search for wood to make a fire, a bucket of clean water to drink, 20 cents to pay a busfare to a clinic, is inclined to set the mind solely on ameliorating such unthinkable concrete hardships. Nothing seems to matter but that people should be quickly fed, housed, given the opportunity to work. Indeed it is this distress of urgency, brought about from time to time before this book was published, by newspaper accounts of resettlement conditions in the few areas that came to open attention, that has led the public of Johannesburg — for example — to do what has become known as "opening its heart" to pour forth from the cornucopia of white plenty, blankets, food, medicine, to warm, feed and tend the tent-and-hovel black "towns". One can only be thankful, in the name of common humanity, that they do so. But, in the name of common humanity, how do people manage to close their minds to the implications of the resettlement policy while at the same time "opening their hearts" to its callous and inevitable results?

Setting aside reflections on the morality of charity in the context of South Africa, the page-by-page account of the lack of basic physical necessities in village after village,

(Continued on page 17)



(Continued from page 9)

cause it is divided in its understanding of a theology of the incarnation.

Were development to mean only giving the necessities of life, there would be no problem. For the Lord gave his commandment to love one another and his injunction to feed the hungry and water the thirsty. And after all, aid to ensure a viable economic growth rate, is just this on an extended scale.

But given our wider definition of development, what are the roots of any theology of development? "In the beginning God created". He created man and his world. In the first account of creation he gave man the charge to conquer the earth. In the second account of creation he settled man in the garden to cultivate it and to take care of it. And God saw that this was good. Man is to be lord of the earth under the Lordship of God. Man thus stands over against nature in the same way as God stands over against man. God names man and gives him meaning. Man names things and gives them meaning. No limits are set on man's dominion over nature other than usurpation of ultimate power. Nature which is made available to man's creativity is not something given once for all but a process capable of development.

Man is responsible to use his stewardship of nature to make possible a fuller human life for all mankind. In this way he regains his original God-given destiny for which Christ died and has risen. For redemption also concerns nature in that the redeemer acts to bring creation into its still hidden destiny, the new creation. According to Romans 8:20, man has a priestly function towards the whole of nature.

## INCARNATIONAL THEOLOGY

*The incarnation of the Word reveals anew that what God looked on and saw as good remains good, even under man's primordial fall, and man's task of transforming this world and shaping it to his uses is likewise confirmed.* For Christ took unto himself the whole of our humanity and thereby sanctified soul, body, sense, and the extension of man into space and time. It is the totality of nature that received (Col. 1:5) sanctification

through the saviour's humanity, crucified and risen. Jesus developed that humanity in himself to its fullest potentialities. It was in and through his own personal history of Bethlehem, Galilee, and Jerusalem that Christ accomplished his salvific task.

This therefore is the sign to us that all properly human development in all its dimensions is a thing of God: man is destined to be more fully man. And insofar as having more is necessary to bring more, material progress is good. It is good, too, because it is or can be a manifestation of that specificity of man as *imago Dei*, which is to be spirit, free, responsible, and creative. The incarnation, in a word, confirms man's vocation to co-operate in God's creativity.

It must in this light appear an aberration to think of this world as a place of exile or something to be bypassed as far as possible, as only a place in which to work out our final destiny as if it were of no significance in itself. Surely it would be a false reading of Scripture to see in the command to feed the hungry, clothe the naked, and shelter the roofless (Mt. 25:31) merely tests by which a final determination of sheep and goats might be effected. Quite the contrary, these works of social service are required because God wants a world in which men live in decency and reasonable comfort.

Salvation, then, is explicitly tied to developing this world. This should come as no surprise: Isaiah, Amos, and other Old Testament prophets consistently tied "knowing God" and receiving his "kindness" to the doing of the works of justice. In this respect the New Testament only confirms the Old: the humanization of life has religious value in itself, for the command to feed the hungry is categorical and unconditional. The task commanded is nothing short of providing for the world's present population and the billions yet to come. This will demand the creation of the social, economic, and political structures of society needed to accomplish this vast task. Our love, in a word, must be creative charity. If we are admonished here that the works of charity are efficacious for salvation only as grounded in Christ and not erected simply on man's potential of freedom, we freely acknowledge this. If we are

reminded further that Christ will work his own final transformation, we can only agree. Nevertheless, it remains true, first, that the works of charity are man's; second, that, as John the Evangelist assures us, Christ's final renewal of this world has its anticipation in the temporal order.

## SOME IMPLICATIONS FOR THE CHURCHES

If the Church in reality sees its function as service to the world, while living in the world and not apart from it (*a euntes docetes* and not a *funga mundi*) then the following are some of the implications:

(i) the Church as an organ of institutionalised criticism should at all times offer a clear critique of policies, of structures, of what is done and what is not done in the secular sphere

(ii) the Church should re-examine the basic objectives of its own programmes and budgets in the light of the urgent tasks of nation-building in developing countries. It should review these in order to ascertain whether they promote fundamental social justice or are only marginal palliatives. A recent survey by Dr. Richard Dickenson concluded that most are in fact traditionalist, i.e. schools and hospitals without any new pioneering work

(iii) in its own programmes and projects the Church should implement the following principles:

(a) human development; enabling both persons and societies to realise the full potential of human life in social justice, self-reliance and economic growth

(b) provision for comprehensive programmes and for specific projects seen in the perspective of national and regional needs

(c) distribution of power with shared decision making

(iv) the Church should initiate a systematic investigation into the attitudes of its people towards development, and towards the peoples and problems of the Third World

(v) churches should contribute not less than 2% of their total income towards development projects and programmes. This amount should be over and above the amount spent on mission and other programmes.



(Continued from page 8)

be a member of the Christian Institute, which is an organisation of individual Christians.

Four days after the original report in the Transvaler another report appeared in the same paper in which it was intimated that the "secessionists" from AICA (I presume secessionists, although the general secretary of AICA had to date of writing received no letters of resignation or withdrawal of churches from AICA) may get help from the N.G. Kerk.

In the light of such possible expansion of this work, I thought it useful to ask and answer some questions:

### QUESTIONS

Is there room for more than one organisation to work in a field of this nature?

Up to now 308 churches have joined AICA. We know that in 1960 there were 2200 churches and many guesses have been made about present numbers. 308 out of 2200 is clear enough evidence that the field is not adequately covered, presuming that all 2200 churches feel the same need for some form of theological training. But there are other reasons also why this work may require additional agencies. Churches differ greatly in theological orientation and may differ in their political outlook. Furthermore, work of this nature needs large financial subsidies and additional agencies can make a welcome contribution.

But agencies working in this field must be clear on some other points as well.

(i) The history of the African Independent Churches has been one of fragmentation. I wonder whether there is an Independent Church which has not either had a secession in its own ranks or did not itself secede from another group. The factors causing fragmentation are many and varied, and I have mentioned some already. Missions are not without blame either. The example set in Africa in missionary endeavour was that of a divided and fragmented church, each fragment trying to make it clear why it was proclaiming the true Christian faith.

When work like that of AICA is started no one should assume that suddenly all the rivalries, jealousies, hatreds or whatever, will have disap-

peared. Working together often brings old enemies face to face, hostile groups which had partially resolved their antagonism by parting and staying well parted. Coming together not only renews old rivalries but focusses them in new power struggles. No group will benefit if now agencies enter this work as supporters of one rival group against another. And God forbid that any White agency should enter this work because their ultimate aim is to hit at another White group.

**Agencies entering this field should be extremely careful not to bring the divisions of denominations into the already fragmented Independent Churches. In this situation where fragmentation is one of the main problems, a witness of reconciliation is needed, not an example of further division.**

Agencies giving help to the African Independent Churches should have a very clear understanding of their objectives and how they wish to attain those objectives. Such understanding can only come, so it seems to me, if the agencies co-operate closely in planning, share all information and mutually trust each other. Agency rivalry will be the greatest disservice yet rendered to the African Independent Churches.

(ii) There is another point which I consider of great importance for any agency working in this field. The African Independent Churches have been able to develop independently of the historical mission churches. Agencies entering this field come in as service agencies, serving Christ by serving the African Independent Churches. Agencies should not try to direct or control the work. This control and direction can sometimes be exercised almost unwittingly by controlling and directing the finances. Agencies should even beware of that subtle danger. True, in theory this is easy to say; in practice it becomes a nightmare of discipline — and what discipline has not at times become momentarily lax. Yet I believe this matter to be of paramount importance for the following reasons:

(a) The Christian faith is not bound to one cultural framework or even conceptual structure. Too often in South Africa a Christian convert has also had to become a "Westerner", at least when living up to expected behaviour.

In the Independent Churches there has been an opportunity for the Christian faith to find expression in forms other than those of White European culture. (This is not denying the fact that no African in South Africa remains unaffected or uninfluenced by the White man's culture). This opportunity to develop new unorthodox forms of expression should not be hindered.

The task of an agency should be to serve the African Independent Churches, not to make them more like the mission churches; and it should never aim at bringing them back into the fold of the Mission Church.

There is much that the White churches and the mission churches can learn from the African Independent Churches. We should not despise the unsophistication that often accompanies their form of worship. (Should the Independent Churches be forced back into our particular forms of expressing our faith, we of the Historical Churches may also lose).

(b) My second reason for believing that an agency should come in as servant, and not master, is that in the African Independent Churches Africans have found avenues for exercising their own initiative and leadership. This should not be taken from them. An agency's task is to bring "know-how" to leaders, but without taking away their initiative or minimize their leadership qualities. An agency should enable churches and their leaders to make their own decisions concerning their work, not to make decisions for them.

It seems to me that work of this kind should keep all these factors in mind and should operate within their framework.

### PITFALLS

Finally, I would like to discuss briefly some of the problems involved in this work. It may help others to be aware of the pitfalls and possibly help them to avoid unnecessary troubles.



1. One of the greatest problems we have had to face has been the problem of the exercising of power. AICA has become more than a programme for theological training. To those who have become deeply involved in the work of AICA it has also become an avenue through which status and recognition can be achieved in African and South African Society. Together with status and recognition goes the opportunity to hold power in a wider sphere than one's particular church.

To be true man is to have "status" and to hold "power". That means, to be recognised as someone important and to be given the opportunity to exercise his abilities.

There is no denying that many of the activities at AICA conferences have centered around "status" and "power", rather than around the immediate needs of churches as they appeared on the agenda papers. In a gamble for status and power there are always the winners, but unfortunately also the losers.

P. C. Lloyd makes a remark in his book "Africa in Social Change" that aptly expresses the reactions of some AICA leaders. He writes:

"The man who fails to achieve his aspirations attributes his lack of success to the hostility, overt or covert, of his near kin. This attitude is displayed today when young men who do not pass examinations ascribe their failure to the plots of jealous relatives rather than to their own lack of ability." (p. 45).

Democracy has the unique ability of making those out of power feel that, "next time round", the tables may be turned. AICA has tried hard to be democratic in elections to ensure that leaders do not despair about their chances in future elections. Whether AICA has achieved this is not clear. That some have sought help from Ds. Nico van Loggerenberg seems to imply that they have despaired — but will backing them solve the

problem brought about by a struggle for status and power?

### WHAT LEVEL?

2. Another problem we face is how to meet the needs of the churches in short enough time so that churches do not become discouraged, but on a high enough level so that the need is truly met.

It appears that one of the group complaints the dissident group brought to Ds. Nico van Loggerenberg was that the Refresher Courses were not adequate. We have at Refresher Courses many ministers who have had no opportunity for formal education above the most elementary standards. Yet they are most keen and very enthusiastic to learn more. Do we structure our course for such as these — and they often appear to form the majority of participants at a course — or do we structure a course for the few more highly educated men? Or should we possibly separate courses? — but that means more financial aid, — and that . . .

3. Thirdly we face the problem of ministers wanting to become marriage officers. The Government requires from them a minimum educational level of Junior Certificate. It is easy to quicken hopes in the minds of men with Standard 2, that they, too, will one day qualify as a marriage officer. But how, with all the goodwill in the world, do you assist a man to fulfil the requirements? It is so easy in moments of enthusiasm to create impressions that through some wonderful new formula these things will be "added unto them", only to have to disillusion them at a next meeting. Speaking through interpreters does not make for better communication. Careful statements so easily become, in translation, glorious promises; and "glorious promises" not kept bring frustration and deep resentment.

### CORRESPONDENCE COURSE

4. I mentioned earlier that young men go to training institutions

and leave their church. It seemed good to us that with the establishment of a theological college at Alice some form of theological training should be made available to those who cannot go to college, due to family or church commitment or age. The only possible means seemed to be through a Correspondence Course. Would a Correspondence Course fill the gap between the younger college generation and an older generation in the church? We hoped that it would at least take the edge off the tension between the two generations. But how does a person teach by correspondence when men barely read and write? That, too, remains one of the unresolved problems in the work. The partial solution we think may be found in modern ways of presenting educational material to students. Our course is under way, the first "workbooks" for correspondence students are at the printers. But the full answer, that remains to be found.

A Theological College and a Correspondence Course both seem to be of basic importance, and the one without the other seems less effective than the two could be together.

But what will new agencies in the field do. Will they each establish their own college and their own correspondence course, or is it too idealistic to hope for fruitful collaboration in such large and expensive projects?

**High ideals and many problems!** That may be the clearest indication of the need for more people to serve in this particular field; more people with new ideas on how to tackle the work; new contacts with financial resources to expand in some areas, more people with diverse talents, more people to pray for this work — all this is greatly needed.



(Continued from page 13)

settlement after settlement, strikes one in the belly, as it were, and leads one to forget that there are other needs to be satisfied in order to make life supportable. After food and shelter are secured, what then? Suppose all the settlements described in this book — even those unimaginable half-worlds, the collections of "surplus people", "redundant people", "non-productive people": the desperately poor aged, the illegitimate children from the labour pool warrens of the towns, the mentally retarded, discarded out of everyone's way, out of the way of life itself, on the veld — suppose all these "closer" and "emergency" and "transit" settlements were to provide decent housing and reasonable satisfaction of the basic physical needs of life. Suppose, in addition, no resettlement were to be set up unless it were first assured that it provided access to equal if not better employment than was available in the place from which any community was moved. Would removals then be acceptable to the conscience and common humanity of a state that designates itself Christian and democratic and a guardian of the values of Western civilisation?

### THE ANSWER? NO!

I do not think the answer can be anything but "no". For even if the material welfare of these men and women and children who are being moved out of the path of the white man were to be secured — and how remote a possibility that is can be seen in this book — they would still be deprived of something unarguably fundamental to the declared values of Christianity, democracy, and Western civilisation: the right of man over his own person. Those who urge only that removals be "better planned", carried out "more humanely" show a preoccupation with man's animal needs that surely must be termed cynical, coming from self-appointed guardians of civilised values.

Once one has got over the first shock of the physical suffering described in this book one becomes increasingly aware of certain signs of another kind of suffering. There is an apathy, the peculiar listlessness of lack of hope shown by many people in the settlements, born of powerlessness to change their situation by any effort of their own, since all decisions about the circumstances of their lives are made for them. Even their fan-

tasies — "people said they had been told that dogs would be set on them if they didn't move" — are so obviously bred of the fear and bewilderment of uprooted people who do not know how their lives and persons will be disposed of next. Every human life, however humble it has been, has a context meshed of familiar experience — social relationships, patterns of activity in relation to environment. Call it "home", if you like. To be transported out of this on a G.G. lorry one morning and put down in

an uninhabited place is to be asked to build not only your shelter but your whole life over again, from scratch.

For the hundreds of thousands who are having this experience forced upon them, there is no appeal.

As for us, the white people of South Africa — if our hearts were ever really to be opened perhaps all we should find would be, graven there, this comment from one of the inhabitants of a resettlement: **You can't say no to a white man.**

(Vervolg van bladsy 6)

Die praeses, dr. Kunst, het, namens die Sinode, daarvan kennis geneem, afgestyg van die verhoog en hom 'n hartlike handdruk gegee. Alles hoogs aandoenlik. Alles weer pais en vree — behalwe dat die Sinode nog nie oor 'n afdoende besluit oor die hele raskwessie en die rol van die N.G. Kerk gekom het nie.

**So maklik was dit ook nie: hier moes waarlik fyn getrap word sonder om wesenlike afbreuk te doen aan beginsels. Broederbande moes bewaar word, dog die nodige vaderlike vermaning kon ook nie uitbly nie. Uiteindelik, na deeglike bespreking, is 'n oplossing gevind.**

Die Sinode het amptelik besluit om hom vierkantig te stel agter die destydse („meerderheids") rapport van die G.E.S. van 1968 (wat, in sy finale formulering, ook belangrike elemente van die sg. „minderheidsrapport" in-korporeer) en waarin, volgens die amptelike „Informatiedienst" van die Nederlandse Gereformeerde Kerke, „iedere vorm van rassendiscriminatie en racisme wordt veroordeeld". Die opskrif bokant die amptelike berig omtrent die Sinodebesluit lui tewens ook, heel duidelik en heel onmisverstaanbaar: „SYNODE VEROORDEELT RASSENDISCRIMINATIE."

### VERMANING

Om egter dubbel seker te maak dat aanvaarding van die amptelike besluit van die G.E.S. nie weer, soos in 1968, as „'n groot oorwinning vir apartheid" vertolk sou word nie en om te verseker dat die Suid-Afrikaanse lidkerke van die G.E.S. ook nou werklik en in die praktyk erns sou begin maak met dié besluit, is daar voorts besluit om ook 'n amptelike „brief van vermaning" tot die kerke in Suid-Afrika — veral dan die N.G. Kerk — te rig „waarin wordt gepleit voor een an-

dere houding inzake het rassenvraagstuk dan in de synoden der Zuidafrikaanse kerken wordt aangetroffen". Bekragtigt deur hierdie vermaningsbrief sou die besluit van die 1968-G.E.S., wat nou ook die amptelike besluit van die Sinode van die Nederlandse Gereformeerde Kerke geword het, werklik nie langer gerieflik misverstaan kon word nie.

Weliswaar het die formulering van hierdie historiese vermaningsbrief, (wat inderhaas die oggend nog deur ds. A. Kruijswijk, assessor van die Sinode, prof. Kuitert en prof. Rothuizen opgestel is), 'n mate van kritiek uitgelok vanweë swak grammatika en lompe bewoording. Gevolglik het die Sinode besluit om dit, as't ware *carte blanche*, aan die moderamen oor te laat om die finale bewoording op te stel. Ook het sommige van die meer konserwatiewe ouderlinge bedenkinge daaroor gehad dat daar so kaalkop van 'n „vermaning" gepraat word: dit sou moontlik die goeie broederlike verhouding tussen die kerke kon skaad. Hulle is deur die praeses daarmee tevrede gestel dat „vermaning" in die lig van „broederlike advies" beskou moes word.

Die Sinode was egter eenparig in sy besluit dat so 'n amptelike brief wel uitgereik moes word. Ook kan daar by niemand enige twyfel bestaan nie dat dié brief wesenlik bedoel is om gewig en beklemtoning te verleen aan die amptelike besluit van die Sinode en dat dié besluit 'n veroordeling inhou van elke vorm van rassediskriminasie en rassisme. Daardeur word die kerke in Suid-Afrika dan ook in baie reële sin voor 'n ultimatum gestel, voor 'n gewetenskrisis wat nie langer ontwyk kan word nie.

Wie dit nog wil misverstaan, kan alleen maar van opperste moedswiligheid beskuldig word.



