

PRO

VERITATE

INHOUD/CONTENTS	
Church Union or Christian Unity?	1
Christen Wees in Hierdie Land	1
Inleidingsartikel	4
Editorial	5
On Being a Tool of Communism	8
Die Kerk Buite Suid-Afrika	10
The Church and Industry	11
All Things Bright and Beautiful	13
Letters/Briewe	14
Aanval op Prof. Van Selms	15
God — Nederland — Oranje	16
Book Review	16

CHRISTELIKE MAANDBLAD VIR SUIDELIKE AFRIKA—CHRISTIAN MONTHLY FOR SOUTHERN AFRICA

Augustus 15 August, 1966

5c

(S.A.) Intekengeld R1 Subscription

Jaargang V, Nr. 4

Volume V, No. 4

By die Hoofposkantoor as Nuusblad geregistreer.

Registered at the Post Office as a Newspaper.

CHURCH UNION OR CHRISTIAN UNITY?

DR. D. W. BANDEY

Is this "or" a genuine one? Are they alternatives, or only two sides of one coin? They are indeed alternatives, except to idealism, because the fact that neither can be complete without the other tells us only about the denotation of two terms. They may be called alternative routes to one goal, but unfortunately the goal is out of sight, so we cannot direct our movements towards it. We must choose one or other route, and move along it, being content to see as far ahead as we can.

The fact is that our procedure if we are aiming at Christian Unity will not, **at this stage**, be the same as it would be if we were aiming at Church Union. Of course, we may find that neither is practicable; we have to travel by faith, not by sight. There are plenty of by-ways leading only to confusion, like those attractive side-paths with which John Bunyan so liberally strewed the Christian's way. But whichever road we take, we shall be involved in (a) conversations with Christians of other denominations, (b) a technique of rapprochement, and (c) some definition of the foreseeable goal. I propose to compare the two alternatives under these heads.

CHURCH UNION

We shall take the word "Church" to mean "an organized community of Christians with common traditions". (The bond is not unity of doctrine, except in the most extreme sects). Certainly traditions do not appear from nowhere; each denomination has had a 'foundation-period' during which its traditions were being formed, and then the chief formative factor was doctrine. But everyone who has tried to sort out the present practice of his Church by reference to doctrinal principles must admit that at the present stage the practice is self-perpetuating.

The 'foundation-period' in the

life of any denomination was necessarily the period when it was most aware of its disagreements with older denominations, and was engaged in most bitter controversy with them. The result is that every reference to that period accentuates denominational division. The more each attempts to be true to his 'fundamental doctrines', the more he will be bound to object to those of others. It therefore follows

inevitably that **conversations with Christians of other denominations**, if concerned with moves towards union, will tend to degenerate into disputes. To consider union between Churches one must discuss their traditions and doctrines; to discuss these one must refer to their historical origins; by doing that one brings into the forefront the very convictions and experiences which made each
(Continued on page 2)

CHRISTEN WEES IN HIERDIE LAND

2. Die Laaste Woord oor God.

PROF. DR. A. VAN SELMS

„Ek het gekom om vuur op die aarde te werp.“ (Luk. 12:49) Wie praat so? Die Here Jesus Christus, die Seun van die Vader. „die afskynsel van sy heerlijkheid“ (Hebr. 1:3), Lig uit Lig, soos die geloofsbelydenis van Nicea dit uitgedruk het. Die ou vaders kon ook gesê het: Gloed uit Gloed. Hy het gekom om vuur op die aarde te werp, soos God vuur op Sodom en Gomorra laat reën het (Gen. 19:24).

LIG EN OORDEEL

Die vuur is die teken van die oordeel. „Elke boom“, so het Johannes die Doper getuig, „wat geen goeie vrugte dra nie, word uitgekap en in die vuur gegooi“ (Luk. 3:9). Van die Christus het hy geprofeteer: „Hy sal die kaf met onuitbluslike vuur verbrand“ (Luk. 3:17). Maar die Here Jesus het ook self met duidelike woorde gesê dat Hy tot 'n oordeel gekom het (Joh. 9:39): „Tot 'n oordeel

het Ek in hierdie wêreld gekom, sodat die wat nie sien nie, mag sien, en die wat sien, blind mag word.“ Die Lig uit die ongeskape Lig is verblindend soos die gloed van duisend sonne. Soos 'n „weerlig wat van die een kant onder die hemel blits en tot die ander kant onder die hemel skyn“, so verskyn die Seun as die Lig in die duister van hierdie wêreld. Dié wat in hierdie duister hulle pad gemaklik kon vind, word
(Vervolg op bladsy 3)

Church Union or Christian Unity?

(Continued from page 1)

denomination reject the other. Either the group will engage in an ineffective study of each other's peculiarities, or the various members will make annoying attempts to prove the correctness of their own traditions and the error of the others.

In such unfavourable conditions, what **technique of rapprochement** is possible? It is instructive to study the Methodist Union of 1932, which is excellently analysed by John Kent in 'The Age of Disunity' (Epworth, 1966). One gains the impression that authoritative persons from each party met several times to discuss what amounted to the barter of traditions, and that between their meetings they tried to assess the feelings of the members of their sections. In the end, each party gave up what it regarded as inessential, and accepted what it could either assimilate or in practice ignore. The resultant compromise was not particularly inspiring; on paper it looked good enough, but it had not been shaped by the enthusiastic convictions of its members, whose emotional loyalty was still to the sections to which they were accustomed. In any such union some members will object so strongly that they will either join other denominations or found new sects; very few did this at the time of Methodist Union. More commonly, and almost everywhere in Methodism, members accept the new constitution because they do not think that it need disturb their local society. There is a fairly strong probability that the present Anglican-Methodist conversations in England are following a similar pattern and will lead to an equally unsatisfactory result. ("The only thing we learn from history is that we learn nothing from history!")

If we try to describe the **foreseeable goal** of such negotiations, we shall easily see why they are likely to prove so nearly futile. They are, in effect, attempts to set up a working union between two elaborate, long-established, and very large organisations. The negotiators are naturally afraid

of being accused of 'selling the pass'; they know very well, already, that accusations of that kind are being made. They must find a solution which demands the least possible disturbance of their community's traditional ways of worship and government; not a federal system, because that would leave each denomination where it is now, with the only novelty a Federal Council which would be ignored. Somehow, by trimming the traditions of two complex monolithic organisations, they must design another complex monolithic organisation sufficiently like the former ones to be acceptable to their members. It must be monolithic, in order to resemble its precursors. It cannot incorporate any drastic reforms, because each party would be sure that they had been imposed by the other, and would reject them. A series of such unions, if such a thing can be imagined, would probably result in something rather like the existing Roman Catholic Church. Doctrine would naturally tend to move in that direction, because dogmatic High Churchmen have considerable advantages over undogmatic and tolerant people: the former shape the Church; the latter merely leave it!

CHRISTIAN UNITY

Study of the route labelled 'Church Union' has revealed that it is not very promising. The alternative can hardly be worse, and may be better. It unfortunately begins with two terms almost impossible to define, but a meaning may emerge as we go on.

There is no need to argue that there should be **conversations between Christians of different denominations** about the verities of faith and life. If my neighbour is a fellow-Christian, conversation is fraternal communion. If he is a heretic, I must try to lead him to a better faith. If I refuse to converse with him, he is entitled to think that I am insecure in my own convictions and dare not risk having them questioned.

What of the **technique of rapprochement**? This is almost equally simple. The participants have a common faith in Jesus Christ as Lord and Saviour, and all accept the Bible as the basis and standard of doctrine (the 'canon'). They confront each other, not with a fixed set of interpretations

and traditions, but as fellow-seekers for the truth in Christ by the grace of the Holy Spirit. If someone should mention the formulae of his own denomination, they will be taken by all, including the speaker, simply as facts to add to the pool of information which is being considered. No one 'represents his denomination'; each adds his knowledge, his opinions and his ability to the equipment which the group is using to find the intention of Christ for His Church in this generation.

This is not as easy as it sounds. It demands much humility and complete sincerity. Many of the participants will find it a new and chastening experience to discard completely the assumption that "the teaching of my community is right." Deeply cherished beliefs about the interpretation of the Scriptures, the meaning of the Sacraments, the significance of Ordination, the oversight of believers, and so on, must be submitted without defensiveness to severe criticism. Nothing must be hidden from the keen edge of the sword of the Spirit. No presuppositions can be admitted about the form of Christian community which God now wants us to build, for the Spirit must not be made to conform to our prejudices.

From such a group concrete proposals for a united Church are not likely to come quickly. When they do come, they are not likely to be welcome to a majority of Christian Church members. To submit one's inherited treasures of custom and doctrine to the searching wind and purifying fire of the Spirit is painful, and there are few who will not flee for refuge to the familiar. Church members will have to educate themselves in interdenominational groups. At the same time, the constituted authorities of each denomination will have to study the implications of the new plans. If every member is emotionally conservative, every administrator is professionally so, and we can be sure that every difficulty will be made to loom larger than life! But these seem to be hindrances resulting from plain human sinfulness, rather than inherent defects in the method itself. The remedy is confession, penitence, and "walking

humbly with thy God", not a frantic search for a technique which will be insensitive to the sin in those who use it.

There is, however, the intrinsic difficulty that there seems to be no **foreseeable goal** on this road. The consultants do not know whether they are to hope for a highly centralized 'great Church', or for something holding its variety under looser control. This is true, but is not an argument against the method. We are in the position in which, according to the Epistle to the Hebrews, Abraham was when he obeyed the call of God (Heb. xi.8). The goal will be known only when it is reached. We are not moving towards something we can define in advance, we are moving as the Spirit guides (John iii.8). We do not know where we shall find ourselves, or what form our community and action will take, but we know that God has prepared for us things that have not yet taken form in our imaginations, and when we meet them He will open our eyes to their rightness.

CONCLUSION

Is it not possible that much well-intentioned effort is proving fruitless because, in our haste, we have sought to unite Churches as they are, instead of waiting for God's plan to become clear? We ought to have seen that only where Christian Unity was largely achieved, as in South India, has Church Union done more than create another denomination. Elsewhere, the old quarrels, rigidities, prejudices and weaknesses remain in a new frame. The World Council of Churches has seen it and is commending the use of the second and apparently slower way. It may well be a long road, but it is rich with rewards at every stage, if we travel "having girded our loins with truth, and having put on the breastplate of righteousness, and having shod our feet with the gospel of peace; above all taking the shield of faith, with which to quench all the fiery darts of the evil one. Taking also the helmet of salvation, and the sword of the Spirit, which is the word of God. Praying at all times in the Spirit, with all prayer and supplication; keeping alert with all perseverance, making supplication for all the saints . . ."

Christen wees in hierdie land

(Vervolg van bladsy 1)

verblind deur hierdie Lig. Alle menslike hulpmiddels en vermoëns taal as Hy verskyn.

Maar in daardie een en ondeelbare oomblik dat die weerlig blits en die oë verblind gaan word, sien hulle vir die eerste keer die wêreld soos dit is. Deur die blits word die wêreld as duisternis ont-hul. Meer as dit deur die verskyning van die Seun ontdek ons dat ons self duisternis is. Geen wonder dan, dat „die mense die duisternis liever gehad het as die lig" (Joh. 3:19). En dit is die oordeel, sê die Evangelie. Uit selfbehoud kruip ons weg in die duisternis, maar selfbehoud teenoor Jesus Christus is verloreheid.

GANSE VOLHEID

„Want dit het die Vader behaag dat in Hom (die Here Jesus Christus) die ganse volheid sou woon" (Kol. 1:19). Alles wat God is, aanskou ons in daardie een en ondeelbare oomblik dat die lig van die hemel af ons skielik omstraal. In sy lig sien ons die lig (Ps. 36:10) — en ons is verblind, soos die apostel Paulus toe Christus aan hom verskyn het op die pad na Damaskus. Alles wat tot nou toe gegeld het, geld nie meer nie. Alles wat tot nou toe in ons oë van waarde was, het sy waarde verloor. Al ons insigte en opinies het verdwyn, soos dwaalsterre as die weerlig neerskiet. Salig is die mens wat dan, met verblinde oë, vra: „Here, wat wil U hê moet ek doen?"

CHRISTUS ALLEEN

Here — daar is geen ander outoriteit nie. In Hom is die ganse volheid, die volledige gesag. Ek het geen eie mening meer nie; ek kan net na sy bevel vra. Miskien het ek lasbriewe van die hoëpriester in my reissak; miskien het ek opdragte van en aan die wêreldlike outoriteite; miskien reken hulle dat ek myself sal inspan om hul bedoelings uit te voer — maar ek vergeet dit alles. Ek vergeet al wat ek tevore wou doen, ek vergeet wat die mag-

hebers van my verwag, ek vergeet my hele verlede, my loopbaan, my posisie, my ideale. My hele bestaan word een vraag: Here, wat wil U hê moet ek doen? Want Hy is die Here, en Hy kan beveel. Hy het die laaste woord. As ek, nadat Hy sy bevel tot my gespreek het, „vles en bloed raadpleeg" (Gal. 1:16), weer dink aan wat ander mense of menslike instansies van my verwag, of aan my eie vles en bloed enige gewig heg, pleeg ek ver-raad aan Hom wat Hom aan my geopenbaar het as die Here. Hy het op my beslag gelê, en as ek my aan daardie beslag onttrek, verleen ek Hom. En dit kan ek nie, want Hy is hier, Hy spreek tot my, Hy het my in sy diens gestel. Niemand kan twee here dien nie; as ek langs Hom 'n ander outoriteit erken, verwerp ek Hom en Hy verwerp my. Laat hoëpriester en goewerneur my dan maar as 'n opstandeling brandmerk! Liever 'n rebel in die oë van hoëpriester en goewerneur as in die oë van die Here.

Christus is die laaste woord van God tot die mensheid (Hebr. 1:1). Daarom en omdat in Hom die ganse volheid woon, kan ons nooit iets aan Hom toevoeg nie. Ons kan nie Christelik wees en dan nog iets anders nie. Christus bedank vir die eer om in een lyn met allerlei menslike waardes gestel te word. Doen ons iets dergeliks tog, dan trek Hy hom terug. Dan laat Hy die terrein oor aan die magte wat ons langs Hom geplaas het, en dan is die duisternis weer op die wêreldvloed. Wie Christelik-nasionaal wil wees, sal weldra ontdek dat hy alleen maar nasionaal is. En as hy dit dan nog maar ontdek! As hy dan nog maar sien hoe die duisternis weer oor sy lewe gekom het! Maar hoe dikwels is 'n mens tevrede met die leë naam van Christus, sonder na Homself te vra! Daar is heelwat lippediens aan 'n Christusbeeld, en daarby kom dit nimmer tot die één beslissende en bevrydende vraag: Here, wat wil U hê moet ek doen? 'n Beeld eis niks nie; dit staan maar net waar ons dit opgestel het, en glimlag. Miskien brand ons 'n kersie daarvoor. Heelwat teologie is nie veel anders nie as ons beligting van 'n beeld, die teenoorgestelde van wat ons in Ges. 60 bely:

(Vervolg op bladsy 6)

Inleidingsartikel:

Apartheid as Anti-Evangelie

Die toenemende mate waarin apartheid selfs deur verantwoordelike kerkfigure gehuldig word as prinsipiële die enigste politieke beleid wat vir Suid-Afrika heil inhou, maak apartheid juis hoe langer hoe verwerpliker.

'n Politieke beleid wat in so 'n mate verabsoluteer word dat alternatiewe beleide prinsipiële uitgeskakel word — en dit is blykbaar wat besig is om met apartheid te gebeur — moet deur Christene prinsipiële verwerp word. En juis wanneer dit met 'n beleid soos apartheid gebeur, moet dit met 'n des te groter beslistheid verwerp word.

Dat die gedagte van „apartheid“ as 'n moontlike oplossing van die rasseprobleem in ons land sekere verdienstelike elemente mag bevat wat ook deur Christene beaam sou kan word, wil ons nie ontken nie. Die Christen kan hom egter alleen onder die grootste voorbehoud met die apartheidsgedagte as sodanig vereenselwig. Want die Skrif weet van 'n uitnemender weg om mense van dieselfde landskuijshouding wat kragtens hulle natuur, beskawingspeil, sosiale stand, ens. van mekaar verskil, in harmonie te versoen; en dit is nie skeiding, „apartheid“ nie.

As die eerste en vernaamste voorbehoud wat die Christen ten opsigte van apartheid het, geld dan die erkenning dat daar 'n uitnemender weg is wat, hoe onaantoonbaar dit ook vir die swakke vlees mag lyk, 'n reële alternatief is — uitnemender as apartheid omdat daar nie angsvallig na sy fundering in die Skrif gesoek hoef te word nie. Die betere en reële alternatief vir apartheid is 'n politieke ordening waarin die broederskap van alle mense en hulle essensiële gelykheid voor God tot sy reg kom en waarin faktore van ras en kleur geen beslissende rol speel nie.

Apartheid kan vir die Christen slegs tolereerbaar wees as dit 'n streng gekwalifiseerde apartheid is. Dit moet apartheid wees met die duidelike besef dat, terwyl die beroep op die Skrif geheel en al daarvoor ontbreek, dit hoogstens miskien nie noodwendig 'n breuk met die Evangelie van Christus hoef te beteken nie: apartheid met die gebed: „Verdra en vergewe dit asseblief, Here, ter wille van ons swakheid“; apartheid met vrees en bewing; apartheid onder die strengste selfkritiek; apartheid nie sonder 'n voortdurende gewetensprikkel nie.

Apartheid se aanvaarbaarheid vir Christene is dus streng voorwaardelik: Dit moet 'n beleid wees wat essensieel gekenmerk word deur die begrensdeheid en die relatiewiteit daarvan, sowel wat sy prinsipiële fundering as sy praktiese toepassing betref. Dit moet sy bestaansreg apologeties bepleit teenoor die betere moontlikheid. Apartheid moet in sy rekening opneem die feit dat daar mense kan wees, en inderdaad ook is, wat dit uit legitiem Bybelse oortuigings verwerp, terwyl hy op niks meer kan aanspraak maak nie as miskien 'n legitiem Bybelse toegeeflikheid. Of apartheid hierdie reële alternatief en sy eie agterstand wat betref 'n prinsipiële, d.w.s.

'n Bybelse fundering ten opsigte van hierdie alternatief erken, daarvan hang dit beslissend af of dit vir Christene enigsins aanvaarbaar mag wees.

Dit word egter hoe langer hoe duideliker — en dit is so bedenklik en ten diepste verontrustend — dat aan hierdie voorwaarde nie meer voldoen word nie. Die politieke beleid van apartheid, wat slegs by die gracie van 'n genadige toelating 'n plek in die skaduwee van die Christelike lewe en Christelike lewensbeskouing mag bekom, 'n plek waarop hy geen grondige aanspraak het nie maar waarom hy moet pleit, ken sy plek nie meer nie. Dit wil die alles-oorheersende en alles-bepalende lewensbeskouing en lewenswyse in Christelike Suid-Afrika word.

Miskien is dit iets wat ons moes verwag het. Is die hele idee van „apartheid“ dalk tog te radikaal teenstrydig met die Evangelie dat dit ooit maar érens in die ruimte van die Christelike lewensopvatting duldbaar is? Vertolk die begrip „apartheid“ nie 'n gesindheid wat van dié van Christus en sy Evangelie so ver verwyder is dat daar géén versoening moontlik is nie en dat dit noodwendig op 'n konflik móét uitloop? Dit word steeds duideliker dat apartheid bely wil word. Dit wil geglo word as die enigste weg van heil vir Suid-Afrika. Dit wil verabsoluteer word as 'n evangelie, as ons enigste toevlug en hoop, as die enigste verskansing van ons bestaansreg en die absolute voorwaarde vir ons bestaansmoontlikheid, sodat elkeen wat hom aan apartheid vergryp, die sonde by uitnemendheid begaan. Maar — en dit is op hierdie punt dat Christene wat die relatiewe bestaansreg van „apartheid“ sou kon toegee, met skrik daarvan terugdeins — daar is slegs één Evangelie waarin, ook vir Suid-Afrika, die heil vir tyd en ewigheid geopenbaar is. Elke ander heilsidee wat op hierdie heilsbetekenis wil aanspraak maak, is nie die Evangelie nie, maar 'n anti-Evangelie. En die Christus wat ingeroep word om sy sanksie daaraan te gee is die Antichris. En die „gemeente“ wat rondom hierdie anti-Evangelie ontstaan, is die anti-kerk. En as 'n kerk hom in trou daarmee verbind en die idees van die nie-evangelie tot 'n element van sy heilsverkondiging maak, is dit 'n valse kerk.

Apartheid vertoon die trekke van 'n anti-Evangelie steeds duideliker en onmiskenbaarder. In 'n grondige onsekerheid van homself vanweë sy gebrek aan ewigheidsgrond en goddelike outoriteit, openbaar die apartheidsges 'n toenemende fanatisme in die ywer om sy totaliteitsaanspraak te verseker. Vanuit die apartheidsgeloof word daar 'n nydige veragting oor andersdenkendes uitgestort, ongeag of hulle op grond van oortuigings wat onbetwisbaar Christelik en Bybels is, anders dink. In die naam van apartheid word daar na die sleutels van die hemelryk gegryp. Apartheid is besig om tot volksgeloof verhef te word, in so 'n mate reeds dat

(Vervolg op bladsy 6)

Editorial:

Apartheid as Anti-Gospel

The very measure in which even responsible churchmen are increasingly paying homage to apartheid as in principle the only political policy beneficial for South Africa is steadily making apartheid more rejectable.

A political policy which is absolutised to such a degree that alternative policies are eliminated in principle — and this is apparently what is happening to apartheid — must be rejected by Christians on principle. And in particular, when this happens to a policy such as apartheid, it must be rejected so much more decisively.

We do not wish to deny that the idea of "apartness" as a possible solution to the racial problem in our country may contain certain elements of merit *which could be endorsed also by Christians*.

Only with the greatest reserve, however, can the Christian identify himself with the idea of apartness as such. For Scripture knows of a more eminent way in which harmoniously to reconcile people of *the same country who differ from each other in respect of their nature, degree of civilization, social status, etc.*; and it is not separation, not "apartness".

The first and most important reservation which the Christian has with regard to apartheid, therefore, lies in the recognition that *there is a better way which, however unacceptable it may appear to carnal man, is a real alternative — better than apartheid because one need not anxiously search for its foundation in Scripture. The better and real alternative to apartheid is a political order in which justice is done to the brotherhood of all men and their essential equality before God and in which considerations of race and colour play no decisive rôle.*

For the Christian apartheid can only be permissible if it is strictly qualified apartness. It can be apartheid only on the clear understanding that, whilst no justification whatsoever for it can be found in an appeal to Scripture, at best perhaps it needs not necessarily be regarded as a breach with the Gospel of Christ: apartheid with the prayer: "Tolerate and forgive it, o Lord, for the sake of our weakness"; apartheid in fear and trembling; apartheid under the strictest self-criticism; apartheid not without a constant prickling of the conscience.

The acceptability of apartheid for Christians is, therefore, strictly conditional: it must be a policy which is essentially characterised by its limitedness and relativity, both as regards its foundation and its practical application. It must plead apologetically for its own right to existence in the face of the better possibility. Apartheid must take account of the fact that there may be, in fact **are** people who reject it on legitimately Biblical grounds, whilst it can lay claim to no more than perhaps a *legitimately Biblical indulgence*. Whether it may be acceptable to Christians to some degree depends decisively on whether apartheid recognises this real alternative as well as its own backwardness in

respect of a basic, i.e. a Biblical foundation, in relation to this alternative.

It is, however, becoming increasingly apparent — and this is what is so serious and most deeply disturbing — that this condition is no longer being met. The political policy of apartheid, which may only gain a place in the shadow of Christian life and the Christian view of life through the grace of a merciful indulgence, a place upon which it has no basic claim, but for which it must plead, no longer knows its proper place. It wants to become the all-powerful and all-determining view and way of life in Christian South Africa.

Perhaps this was to be expected. Is not perhaps the whole idea of "apartness" too radically divergent from the Gospel ever to be tolerated anywhere within the sphere of the Christian view of life? Does not the concept of "apartness" represent an attitude which is so far removed from that of Christ and his Gospel that they cannot be reconciled and that a conflict between them is utterly inevitable? It is becoming steadily more apparent that apartheid demands to be confessed. It wants to be believed in as the only way of salvation for South Africa. It wants to be absolutised as a gospel, as our only refuge and hope, as the only entrenchment of our right to existence and the absolute condition for the very possibility of our existence, so that anyone who offends against apartheid, commits the ultimate sin. But — and it is on this point that Christians who might concede the *relative right to existence of "apartness"* recoil from it with dismay — there is only **one** Gospel in which, for South Africa also, the salvation for time and eternity is revealed. Every other idea of salvation which wants to lay claim to this power of salvation is *not the Gospel*, but an anti-Gospel. And the Christ who is dragged in to lend his sanction to it, is the anti-Christ. And the "congregation" which comes into being and gathers around this anti-Gospel is the anti-Church. *And if a church binds itself in loyalty to it and makes of the ideas of the non-gospel an element of its own preaching of salvation, it is a false church.*

Apartheid is displaying the characteristics of an anti-Gospel ever more clearly and unmistakably. *In its basic uncertainty of itself, due to its lack of an eternal foundation and divine authority, the spirit of apartheid is revealing an increasing fanaticism in its zeal to ensure its totalitarian claim. From the credo of apartheid there issues an angry contempt of dissentient elements, regardless of whether they disagree on the basis of convictions which may be undeniably Christian and Biblical. In the name of apartheid hands are stretched out to the keys of the kingdom of heaven. Apartheid is being elevated to the status of a national faith, to such a degree already that dissenters are branded enemies of the people without further ado; and*

Continued on page 6

Apartheid as Anti-Evangelie

(Vervolg van bladsy 4)

afwykendes sonder meer as volksvyande bestempel word; en vir sover hulle Christengelowiges is, word hulle geloosintegriteit onder die diepste ste verdenking gebring. Apartheid het 'n haatpropaganda ontkenen nie slegs teen sy politieke skeptici en teenstanders nie, maar selfs teen Christene en kerke wat die één, ewige Evangelie nie vir die apartheidsidee wil verruil of deur sy kettery wil laat besoe del nie. Daarom het hierdie apartheid vir Christene totaal verwerp lik geword. As dit waar is dat 'n Christen geen kommunist kan wees nie, ewemin kan hy 'n apartis wees.

En as daar dan retories gevra word wat dan die alternatief vir Suid-Afrika is, versterk dit die Christen slegs in sy oortuiging dat apartheid verwerp moet word 'n Beleid, so moeilik regverdigbaar vanuit Christelike oogpunt soos apartheid, wat so absoluut wil wees dat dit alle alternatiewe uit die gesigsveld van sy aanhangers wegvaag, moet deur Christene net so absoluut verwerp word 'n Volk vir wie Jesus Christus die enigste Weg van saligheid in tyd en ewigheid is, mag nooit van 'n politieke beleid wat hoogstens érens aan die rand van die Evangelie geduld kan word, glo dat dit die enigste weg is nie.

'n Omvattende volksbekering is die alternatief vir apartheid in Suid-Afrika, die enigste alternatief as ons Christus nie as ons gedugte Opposisie wil hê nie — die Rots wat elkeen op wie Hy val, vermorsel. As ons Hom aan ons kant wil hê, as ons aan sy kant wil staan, moet ons Apartheid die rug toekeer. En kan ons meer sê as dat daar miskien, ja miskien, in die gemeenskap van Christus van „apartheid“ gepraat kan word wat, as 'n genadige toeweging aan ons swakheid, slegs met 'n heel klein lettertjie geskrywe kan word? Dit is inderdaad die vraag of dit nie reeds te veel gesê is nie. Maar vir die gelowiges het hierdie vraag sy angstigheid, sy dringendheid, sy skerpte verloor.

Apartheid as Anti-Gospel

(Continued from page 5)

inasmuch as they are Christian believers, the integrity of their belief is brought under the gravest suspicion. Apartheid has unleashed a hate propaganda campaign, not only against its opponents and political sceptics, but even against Christians and churches who refuse to substitute the idea of apartheid for the one, eternal Gospel or to allow it to be defiled by its heresy. That is why apartheid has become completely rejectable for Christians. If it is true that a Christian can be no communist, neither can he be an apartist.

And if, then, the rhetorical question is put as what the alternative should be for South Africa, it merely strengthens the Christian's conviction that apartheid should be rejected. A policy, so difficult to justify from the Christian viewpoint as apartheid, which wants to be such an absolute that it obscures its followers' vision of all alternatives, must be rejected just as absolutely by Christians. A people for whom Jesus Christ is the only Way of salvation in time and eternity dare never believe of a political policy, which at best can only be tolerated somewhere on the outskirts of the Gospel, that it is the only way. An all-embracing conversion of the people is the alternative to apartheid in South Africa, the only alternative if we do not want to have Christ as our formidable Opposition — the Rock that crushes everyone upon whom He falls. If we want Him on our side, if we want to be on His side, we must turn our backs upon apartheid. And can we say more than that perhaps, as the barest of possibilities, there might, in the communion with Christ, be some mention of "apartheid", which, as a merciful concession to our weakness, would have to be spelt in anything but capital letters? It is, in fact, a moot point whether this is not already going too far. For believers, however, this question has lost its quality of anxiety, of urgency, of sharpness.

Christen wees in hierdie land

(Vervolg van bladsy 3)

„Ontwaak, jy wat slaap, en staan op uit die dood, en Christus sal lig oor jou lewe!”

EISE VAN DIE LIEFDE

Die lewende Christus stel eise. Hy wys die lippediens af: „Wat noem julle My: Here, Here! en doen nie wat Ek sê nie?” (Luk. 6:46). Hy beveel, omdat Hy die Here is; Hy is die Lig en die lig bring lewenshervorming. Hy is die ewige liefde, en elke liefde stel eise. Die volkome liefde vra om volkome erkenning. Daardie erkenning, die geloof, is lewenspraktyk. Omdat in Christus die ganse volheid woon, eis Hy ook die ganse mens op. Hoe hoër die liefde is wat tot ons kom, des te strenger is ook die eise wat dit aan ons stel.

En watter eise stel Christus, God se laaste woord aan ons, aan ons lewe? Nou kan ons maar weer teruggaan tot wat ons in die vorige artikel bespreek het. Ons uitgangspunt was Jes. 33:14, die sidderende vraag: „Wie van ons kan woon by 'n verterende vuur?” Wie kan dit uithou by die gloed van die ewige liefde? Alleen hy wat hom daaraan ooraee, wat daardeur deurdring word, wat hom met die vuur laat doop en so een van sin en gees met die liefdegloed word. En so volg daar dan ook onmiddellik op die sidderende vraag die strenge antwoord: „Hy wat in geregtigheid wandel en spreek wat reg is” (Jes. 33:15). Lewenspraktyk! Dit gaan om geregtigheid, dit wil sê om die verhouding tot die naaste. As u daar nog aan twyfel, lees dan verder in dieselfde vers: „... wat gewin deur afpersing versmaad, wat sy hande uitkud om geen omkoopgeskenk aan te gryp nie...” Sien u dat die geregtigheid, wat die woord van God eis, die verhouding tot die naaste betref? Dit gaan om geregtigheid, dit wil sê om die erkenning van die regte van ons medemens. Moenie sê dat die gedagte van die menseregte 'n menslike uitvinding is, die vrug van die Franse Revolusie, en dat

die mens geen regte teenoor God het nie. Natuurlik het die mens geen regte teenoor God nie, maar dit gaan hier om my naaste se regte wat ek moet eerbiedig, omdat God dit van my eis. As ons spreek oor menseregte, spreek ons nie van regte waarop ek my kan beroep nie, maar oor verpligtings jeens die naaste, wat ek moet erken.

Ons het ook verwys na Hebr. 12:29: „Want onse God is 'n verterende vuur.” Dit is die laaste vers van daardie hoofstuk, maar dit is nie die laaste vers van die brief nie. Die hoofstukke-indeling is later aangebring; die eerste vers van hoofstuk 13 volg dus onmiddellik op wat ons aangehaal het. En wat is dit wat onmiddellik volg? „Die broederliefde moet bly”. Dit is die eis wat Christus aan ons stel: die broederliefde. „As iemand sê: Ek het God lief — en sy broeder haat, is hy 'n leuenaar; want wie sy broeder, wat hy gesien het, nie liefhet nie, hoe kan hy God liefhê wat hy nie gesien het nie? En hierdie gebod het ons van Hom dat hy wat God liefhet, ook sy broeder moet liefhê” (1 Joh. 4:20, 21).

En wie is daardie broeder? As u die vraag stel, weet u ook die antwoord. Want dit is dieselfde vraag wat 'n skrifgeleerde, wat homself wou regverdig, aan Jesus gestel het: „En wie is my naaste?” (Luk. 10:29). U weet watter antwoord die Here gegee het: in dié besondere geval wat dit 'n Samaritaan, 'n lid van 'n ander volk, 'n gehate, 'n veragte, waarmee die Jode geen gemeenskap wou hê nie. Vir die liefde wat Jesus van u eis, verdwyn die grense van nasie en ras. So staan dit in die Bybel, so het Christus gespreek.

„KAFFERBOETIES”

Moet ons dan „kafferboeties” word? Ja natuurlik! Wees daarvan verseker, dat onder die smaadwoorde wat die Satan tot die Here Jesus gerig het, die woord „menseboetie” nie die geringste was nie. Daar is veel minder verskil tussen u en u ontroue huisbediende as tussen die ewige Seun van God en u. En tog sing ons (Ges. 106:3):

„U, wat as Hemelkoning
in heerlijkheid regeer,
soek onder mense woning,
daal as ons broeder neer.”
Sal ons wat ons in Christus

prys, in ons eie lewe afwys? „Wie sy eie broeder wat hy gesien het, nie liefhet nie . . .” Maar juis die feit dat ons ons broeder sien, maak dit dikwels so moeilik vir ons om hom lief te hê! Ons sien in hom soveel wat vir ons vreemd is, wat ons afstoot, wat ons vrees opwek. Wie sal dit ontken? Christus seker nie, en daarom laat Hy ons ook nie alleen met sy gebod nie, maar wil Hy ons sy Heilige Gees skenk.

(In ons volgende uitgawe: Heilige Gees, werk in ons harte).

* * *

THE LAST WORD ABOUT GOD

The author bases his argument on the statement that Christ is the last word of God to mankind (Heb. 1:1). According to Scripture Christ came to cast fire upon earth (Luke 12:49). Scripture also says of Him that He is the bright reflection of God's glory (Heb. 1:3). The coming of Christ meant that the world was revealed in its sinfulness by the blinding glow of God's glory. Blinded by the light of God, man can only ask, like St. Paul: "Lord, what do you wish me to do?" Christ, God's last word to man, has revealed to us that we have no other Lord. He lays claim to us and tolerates no other masters next to Himself to share His honour. He refuses the "honour" of being put on a par with all kinds of human values. That is why we cannot be "Christian-National". And he who insists on being this nevertheless, discovers soon enough that he is merely national, but that he has lost Christ. Christ is eternal love and this love, like all love, imposes its demands. The nobler the love, the stricter its demands. He demands of us a complete surrender to Him. The answer to the question posed in the previous article: "Who among us shall dwell with the devouring fire?" (Is. 33:14) is given here. Man can also surrender himself to the flame of eternal love, become permeated by it, be baptized in it. "He that walketh righteously and speaketh uprightly" (Is. 33:15) can dwell with the devouring fire of God's love. There is a close resemblance between the train of thought in Isaiah and that in the letter to the Hebrews. Heb.

12:29 reads: "For our God is a consuming fire", and in Chapter 13:1 there immediately follows: "Let brotherly love continue". Righteousness and love for the neighbour are the demands placed upon us by the love of God. And who the neighbour is, Jesus taught us in the parable of the good Samaritan. The neighbour of the Jew is here revealed as a member of a hated, despised people with whom the Jews refused to have any truck. This lesson concerning God is of great importance to the whites in South Africa. The love of God demands of us that we should be nigger-lovers ("kafferboeties"). Christ, the King of Heaven, Himself became the brother of sinners. Christ in His mercy knows, however, how difficult it is for us to love our brother. That is why He did not leave us alone with His commandment. He gives us the Holy Spirit.

(In our next issue: Come Holy Spirit, work in our hearts)

PRO VERITATE

Verskyn elke 15de van die maand.

Korrespondensie en Administrasie:

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

Redaksionele Bestuur:

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

Assistent-redakteur:

Dr. B. Engelbrecht.

Redakteur:

Ds. C. F. B. Naudé.

Intekengeld vooruitbetaalbaar:

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

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

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

LET WEL

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

THE TROUBLED HEART

ON BEING A TOOL OF
COMMUNISM

DR. W. BRUCKNER DE VILLIERS

At its recent annual congress, the Afrikaanse Studentebond authoritatively declared that the Christian Institute was "a tool in the hand of Communism". Since I happen to be an active member of the Institute, I could not but sit up and take notice of such fighting talk.

This oracular pronouncement, issuing, at it were, from the foothills of Olympus gives me pause and invites some serious soul-searching. For the A.S.B., after all, happens to be a kind of juvenile representative of the self-glorifying and -deifying institution calling itself Afrikanerdom, to whose sacred society I, too, ironically happen to belong as a member by birth.

One could, of course, dismiss the witless allegation of these regimented young party-liners and juvenile devotees at the altar of nationalist ideology with the contempt it deserves. (Who would, after all, ever have dreamt, in this "enlightened" century, of a group of 200-odd budding "intellectuals", the future spiritual leaders of Afrikanerdom, blindly assenting to every extremist proposal put before them, parroting in monolithic unison the bigotries of their cynical elders? What has happened to our universities? What has happened to our so-called students? What has become of the rebelliousness of youth and the much vaunted freedom of academic thought?)

WHAT IS COMMUNISM?

But the content of this allegation, however uninformed, however fatuous, however doltish, still gives one pause. Could it really have come to this? Could there really exist even the slightest suspicion that an innocuous body like the Christian Institute, that oneself as a member of this Institute, as a Christian, as a fellow-Afrikaner, could in any way whatsoever have succumbed to the wiles of Communism and could therefore have become a subversive and suspect "tool in the hand of Communism"?

What is this "Communism" collaboration of which I am accused by the ringleaders of the youth of my own people? Obviously I am not in reality guilty of this gross treachery of which I am accused by the children of my people, by the leaders and representatives of adolescent Afrikanerdom. But what is this horrifying spectre, this

monster conjured forth by a feverish imagination, which haunts their troubled souls? What is the terrible form it assumes in their indoctrinated minds?

What is this "Communism" of which these young busybodies — like their heart-hardened elders at whose instigation they obviously indulge in such senseless fatuities — imagine me to be "perhaps unknowingly a tool"?

It is, for a start, surely not the revolutionary philosophy of dialectical materialism as expounded by Marx, Engels and Lenin upon which present-day Communism is theoretically and historically based. For, of this I am quite convinced, not even five per cent of the most vociferous protagonists of militant "Anti-Communism" in this country have ever got round to making a thorough study of unexpurgated editions of fundamental Communist literature, such as, for instance, Karl Marx's "Das Kapital" — just as little as ninety-five per cent of the staunchest propounders and defenders of the Calvinist faith have ever taken the trouble of reading the full text of Calvin's "Institutes of the Christian Religion". Their fervent condemnation of what they choose to call "Communism", in other words — like their sickly suspicion of the Christian Institute as "a tool of Communism" — is based not on knowledge, but on hearsay; not on objective research, but on superstitious prejudice; not on a realistic assessment of facts, but on preconceived notions and categorical aprioristic judgements.

But the very categorical quality of their opposition to what they regard as "Communism" and the convulsiveness of their obsession

with it imply that it is, for them, not a mere figment of the imagination, but something very real, very dangerous, very threatening — at least as real to their minds as his own pet hallucination is to the mentally disturbed inmate of an asylum.

What, then, is this awful apparition by which they consider themselves threatened, which they keep on warning each other about, which has reduced them from once proud and fearless people into a terror-stricken generation of gibbering alarmists and screaming xenophobes?

ANOMALOUS

The thought occurred to me that it might just perhaps be the fundamental godlessness of true Communist ideology which appals and terrifies these dedicated witch-hunters who are so vociferous in their denunciation of the "Communist infiltrators" in our midst. But this supposition, too, must be dismissed almost as soon as it is formulated. For nowhere among all the denunciations of "Communism" by which we are intermittently deluged have I noticed any real concern for the honour of God or any real perturbation about the possibility of the emergence of a truly godless society in South Africa. In fact, even the foremost defenders of the hallowed traditions of White South Africa appear to regard the considerable measure of godlessness which has, without the aid or intervention of Communism, already become rife in present-day South African society with the utmost equanimity and imperturbability.

Apart from which it seems to me completely anomalous — if godlessness were indeed to be the ultimate reason for the dedicated opposition to "Communism" — that it should so often be specifically against men of God and the representatives of purely religious institutions that the sharpest attacks

of the anti-Communist coterie should be directed.

So this, too, cannot be the real reason for our local brand of militant anti-Communism, and in this respect, too, the resemblance between real Communism and the local bogey is incidental rather than actual.

Somewhat closer to the mark it seems to me, would be the supposition that it is the pronounced egalitarian element contained in Communism that frightens our local defenders of the "Christian-National" tradition: the commonly held view that Communism is based on a materialistic share-and-share-alike political philosophy which, if practically applied in Southern Africa, would inevitably lead to a one-man-one-vote political system and thus to a cataclysmic swamping of the civilized White minority by the barbaric Black proletariat.

Now this is an argument which could indeed carry quite some considerable weight — were it not for the real facts of the matter.

Apart from the fact that, however egalitarian its motives, real Communism, as practiced in Russia and China for instance, has never yet resulted in a one-man-one-vote system, but only in a system where the man in the street has no vote worth taking any serious notice of at all, there are the realities of our South African situation to be taken into account. For surely all organised attempts at a violent overthrow of the local government on the strength of deliberate Communist instigation have, according to the proud admission of the Chief of Police himself, been effectively crushed and our efficient police force are keeping the situation under control with the most commendable vigilance.

If one were to pay serious heed to all the ranting going on in dedicated anti-Communist circles, our police have made a complete hash of the job. Dangerous Communists, Communist sympathisers and "tools of Communism" are still walking around in broad daylight and some of our churches and an openly active body like the Christian Institute are simply riddled with subversive elements and evil enemy infiltrators!

It is obvious that the high command of the South African Security Police and the leaders of our local Anti-Communist Front (like the Federal Bureau of Investigation and

the John Birch Society in America) have never got round to comparing notes and that the Communism which the former have effectively quelled and the "Communism" which is still giving the latter the jitters are two completely different phenomena which have virtually nothing in common.

THE DREADED "THING": CRITICISM

One is, therefore, yet once again constrained to ask: since it is obviously not real Communism, not the dangerous activist Communism with which the South African Police have had to deal so harshly, not militant Communism as the rest of the world understands it, with which our local noisy anti-Communist fraternity are so obsessed, what is it in actual fact? What is this omnipresent bogey, this spectre, this awesome hallucination that so upsets them?

This is a really sticky question for any normally rational and logical man to answer. One's only hope in seeking for an answer lies, as far as I can see, in an attempt to identify oneself temporarily with the sickly fears of these hallucinated minds: in trying for a moment to see the "enemy" who for them is so real, in trying to behold this monster "Communism" through their minds' eyes. And having made this attempt, ever so briefly, I venture to suggest that I have managed to catch the merest glimpse of what terrifies them so.

The "Thing" they really fear is **Criticism!**

By some crude, Orwellian, involution of perverted logic, they have apparently come to argue as follows:

Communism, according to the laws of this country, constitutes high treason;

criticism of official policy and especially of the practical execution of this policy, even though it be in the light of the Christian gospel, is, in the judgment of all the powers that be, something bordering so closely on the highly treasonable that it makes no difference;

therefore, Criticism equals Communism! Q.E.D.

And this is what so upsets them, this fearsome thing Criticism, conveniently labelled "Communism" or, now and then for variety's sake, "Liberalism" and "Humanism", those only slightly less treasonable

junior partners in crime of "Communism".

Of course it upsets them. Nobody likes to be criticised — especially not somebody who has been convinced and has succeeded in convincing himself that his own and his fellows' policies and actions are irreproachable, beyond the pale of criticism, supremely enlightened, almost divinely inspired. When an ideology becomes an idol, a political policy a categorical imperative, Apartheid an absolute, any disagreement, any divergence in opinion, any honest criticism must inevitably be regarded as high treason, as *lèse-majesté*, as sacrilege. Then common justice, the rule of law, the moral principles of Christendom become suspect and subversive; then an innocent body like the Christian Institute becomes, almost automatically, a "tool of Communism", merely because it dares to criticise, in fact, considers itself duty bound to do so . . .

FOOLISH

According to this demented way of thinking, this mad "logic", all disagreement must be promptly labelled, all criticism classified, all critics subjected to a vituperative smear campaign. According to such a cock-eyed standard of judgment, my own wife would probably have to be regarded as a "Neo-Fascist Stooze", simply because she does not completely agree with everything I have written thusfar!

How foolish can one become, how immature, how infantile and irresponsible in one's judgements?

What the apostles of Anti-Communism steadfastly fail to realise is that honest and responsible criticism as such seeks not to subvert, but to convert; that it is not a vicious pastime sporadically indulged in by crackpots and cranks, but the inescapable duty of everyone calling himself a responsible citizen and a practising Christian. If the present deciders of our national destiny and arbiters of nationalist conformism could only desist for a while from searching for the subversive in all basic disagreement and start applying the strictures of self-criticism to themselves, one might start hoping for signs of an honest conversion and a relaxation of the psychological pressures of bigotry by which we

(Continued on page 10)

On being a tool of Communism

(Continued from page 9)

as a self-proclaimed Christian people are at present obsessed.

If I were to be allowed one suggestion to our ardent agitators in the Anti-Communist cause, it would be this:

Why not broaden the scope of your aversion for a change?

Why not incorporate another dirty word in your vocabulary of epithets? Why not start ranting about the fountainhead of all the "Isms" by which 20th Century spiritual life is plagued: Totalitarianism?

According to my understanding of this nasty word, it means any spiritual regimen which lays total claim upon the minds, hearts and

lives of its sycophantic followers and slaves.

In the light of this definition, of course, Communism, as the rest of the world understands it, is completely totalitarian. So is Nazism, Fascism and all the other extremist "Isms" by which we are beset. And so is any chauvinistic political ideology which paralyses the minds and hardens the hearts of even the young intellectuals of a once up-standing, proud and rebellious people.

Totalitarianism, wherever it occurs, reduces its slaves to the status of unthinking fools and idiots at best and of inhuman monsters at worst. I suppose that we, here in this country, must be grateful that we have at the moment still only to bear with the more advanced stages of foolishness and idiocy.

* * *

It occurs to me as an afterthought that Christ Himself would have had a particularly hard time of it in our country with its present standards of authoritative and accredited judgment. Poor Christ, our Lord and spiritual Master! He with His radical and revolutionary, His "liberalistic" and "humanistic" views as regards the justice of God, the dignity of the fellow-man, the equality of all men in the eyes of His Father and the necessity for sacrifice and following Him at all costs — He would really have been a prime target for all the barbs of our present-day Anti-Communist faction! What an incorrigible **agent provocateur** He was! He could indeed have considered Himself lucky if He were called a "tool of Communism" . . .

DIE KERK BUITE SUID-AFRIKA

PROF. B. B. KEET

Roomse Reaksie op die „God is Dood” Teologie

Van Rooms-Katolieke kant het hierdie teologie groot aandag geniet. In „De Bazuin” (Nederland) kom ’n artikel voor wat van genoegsame belang is om aangehaal te word:

Wanneer Jesus Christus die openbaring is van God d.w.s. die sigbaarwording van die Onsigbare, en dit alles op ’n totale uitputtende wyse, dan hou dit in dat die konkrete lewe van hierdie mens ons presies vertel wat die Onsigbare van Homself wil laat sien. Maar dit hou ook in dat hierdie konkrete lewe die enigste plek is waar ons God kan vind, die enigste trefpunt waar ons Hom kan ontmoet. Ons moet nie buite ons leefwêreld soek nie, êrens in die ondeurdringbare ruimtes nie, maar binne ons leefwêreld. Wie Hom elders soek, soek tevergeefs, ja, moet tevergeefs soek, daar Hy slegs op een punt Homself laat vind, een blik laat slaan in sy ondeurgrondelike wese: Jesus Christus, die mensgeworde God.

Die vraag is of ons twyfel aan ’n lewende God nie voortkom uit die feit dat ons die kersgebeure nie ernstig opneem nie. Durf ons ten aansien van hierdie sentrale geloofsfeit wel konsekwent wees? Want as ons konsekwent is, kan ons die geloofsontwikkeling van die evangelis Johannes meemaak. Hy is immers gekonfronteer deur ’n mens wat sonder meer aan ander mense wel gedoen het; vir wie die sieke ’n lewende uitnodiging was tot effektiwiese hulp; vir wie die tekortskietende mens ’n lewende smeekbede was om begrip en bemoediging; vir wie ’n vermoede menigte ’n lewende vraag was om sorgsame hulp. Anders uitgedruk: Johannes het in sy lewe ’n man ontmoet wat, met ver-

bysien van homself, in sy hele konkrete lewe op ’n ander gerig was.

Maar behalwe dit het hy gehoor en geglo dat hierdie daadwerklike naasteliefde juis die sigbaarwording van God ingesluit het. Hy het gehoor en geglo dat hierdie konkreet liefhebbende mens God in mensegestalte was. En daarom kon hy, omdat hy gesien en gehoor en geglo het, aan die einde van sy lewe skryf dat God liefde is. Hierdie Godskennis het hy nie van elders verneem nie, maar afgelees uit die lewe van Jesus Christus. Waar dit op aankom, is wat agter hierdie evangeliese taal lê, nl. die rotsvaste geloofsoortuiging dat die misterieuze God kenbaar en toeganklik geword het vir die mens, en wel in ’n histories

en geografies bepaalde menselewe. Dit kom dáárop aan dat ons glo dat God juis in die feitlik gerealiseerde liefde van Jesus Christus ’n werklikheid vir ons, ’n menslike werklikheid geword het. In ons soek en vra na God is hierdie geloofsinsig fundamenteel: Hoe ons die saak omkeer of wysig, altyd weer sal ons kom by die mens, Jesus Christus, ’n menslike werklikheid. In Hom word die God van heil openbaar. Maar dit beteken meteens dat Hy in dié mens verskuild is, soos ons dankbaarheid in die handdruk verskuild is. Net soos ons geen pure dankbaarheid teekom nie, so kan ons ook geen pure God teekom nie, d.w.s. God wat nie in ’n aardse werklikheid geïnkarnear is nie. Die alles oorstygende God bly ten emale ontoeganklik en onbereikbaar vir ons. Buite Christus om kom God nie in sig nie.

Om misverstand te voorkom word met klem daarop gewys dat hier nie beweer word dat die menslike liefde God is nie, maar dat die menslike liefde die openbaring van God is. Enersyds moet gestel word dat die menslike liefde die werklikheidsopenbaring van God is, maar die wese van God gaan nie in die menslike liefde op nie, d.w.s. die menslike liefde as werklikheidsopenbaring van God is ’n „gedeel-

telike" onthulling van sy ondeurgrondlike wese. Eintlik skiet ons woorde en begrippe hopeloos te kort. Laat ons dit maar weer sê met die woorde van Johannes: as ons mense onderlinge liefde werklikheid laat word, dan neem God verblyf by ons; dan word Hy opnuut die God van naby, die God met ons, die God onder ons. Dan word Hy 'n werklike werklikheid omdat die liefde die mees werklike werklikheid is. Vir die gelowige het die menslike liefde 'n goddelike diepte, juis omdat God in dié liefde aanwesig is.

* * *

Die Algemene Vergadering van die United Presbyterian Church van Amerika het met 'n byna eenparige stem die voorgestelde gerevideerde konfessionele posisie van dié kerk aangeneem. Amendemente wat in die vergadering behandel is, het met weinige uitsonderinge misluk, en die entoesiasme vir die nuwe formulering was so groot dat die vooruitsig op 'n twee-derde meerderheid van van die presbiterieë, wat nodig is om die besluit van die Assembly te bekragtig, byna vanselfsprekend is. „So het vir die eerste keer in meer as drie-honderd jaar die kerk opnuut sy geloof bely”, skryf „Presbyterian Life”. „Vir die eerste keer in sy geskiedenis wil die Presbyteriaanse Kerk in Amerika op formele wyse die hele historiese omvang van sy groeiende begrip van die Christelike geloof erken, soos dit uitdrukking vind in geloofsbelydennisse van Nicea af tot by die konfessie van 1967.”

* * *

Indonesië: Protestantse Groei. „Die aantal Protestante in Indonesië neem sinds 1961 tweemaal so hard toe as die groei van die nasionale bevolking. En dit terwyl die Protestantse gesinne, wat kindertal betref, in die algemeen kleiner is as onder Indonesiese gesinne”. So lui 'n verklaring van prof. Tan Goan Tjiang, direkteur van die Demografiese Instituut te Djakarta, en penningmeester van die Indonesiese Raad van Kerke. Prof. Tjiang, wat tewens hoogleraar in die ekonomie aan die Staatsuniversiteit van Djakarta is, sê dat op 'n inwonertal van 105 miljoen in Indonesië daar ruim 5 miljoen Protestante en ongeveer 2 miljoen Rooms-katolieke is. — (Uit Persbureau der Nederlandse Hervormde Kerk).

THE CHURCH AND INDUSTRY

III

THE REV. JOHN ROGAN

It is clear from any social analysis that the Church can hardly perform its apostolate and service if it confines itself to the traditional offices of preaching and teaching in church buildings. Territorial neighbourhood has become relatively less important in modern living and functional relationships have become relatively more important. The people near whom we have our house are not the people with whom we work. The people with whom we work are not the people with whom we travel to business nor, very often, the people with whom we take our leisure. We make up in ourselves a number of different roles which we put on and take off according to the time, the place, and the need. We live and move on a city wide basis.

The industries of the world's chief cities draw their labour and management from a vast area. Because the relationships of an urban-industrial area are segmental and diverse rather than unitary and simple, the Christian church must deploy its clergy and rearrange its organization to take account of this. As we have chaplains for schools, the forces, hospitals and even the prisons, so we need to have clergy deployed to industry, for there too a community exists. Many people find this hard to grasp; but the fact is that industry is a community in which people are immersed many hours a day, from the time they leave school until the day they retire: It is this industrial community that provides the material dynamic of many modern societies and largely determines people's standards of living. How can it be ignored when it is such a potential factor for either good or evil?

ADAPTATION

Industrial Mission, therefore, is first of all the realization that we are moving into a world which is increasingly industrialized and where men live in large city regions. **As a result of this understanding of society, the Church resolves that it must adapt its organization in order to minister to people effectively and baptize the new social structure, by bringing it under the scrutiny of the Christian conscience.** As a first step, this means appointing some clergy to move freely about in industrial life so that they can begin to build up relationships with people in all parts of it. By this process, and by making it clear that the Church is not touting for money a number of things have become possible.

The principal industrialists of an area have become well-known and have been willing to assist the

Church in this form of ministry, by advising her about social and industrial issues. The Church has benefited from expert advice "on the inside" rather than from professional students reading books assiduously on the outside!

OPPORTUNITIES

Where the factory processes permit it, factory visitation has been commenced, after agreement with the management and whatever form of worker representation a company possesses. People are sometimes surprised about this, and wonder that anybody can talk during the working day; but there are very, very few processes that prevent a chaplain from walking round a works, and in every factory there are breaks for meals. There are many chaplains who think that this face to face contact on the work site is the foundation from which nearly everything else springs.

Nevertheless there are circumstances in which visitation is not possible, but this does not mean that Industrial Mission comes to an end. I am working in such a company situation at the moment but find that through careful planning and by encouraging lay leadership I can conduct a ministry effectively.

It has been possible here and elsewhere to move on to a further stage of Industrial Mission work, which consists of convening informal groups for discussion and study. The conversation that takes place during a short meal break is not always at the deepest level but it is serious in intent, and if the chaplain or a member has done his preparation it can be well-informed and theologically perceptive.

It is certainly better than radio discussions initiated by experts; these speakers can be interrupted. At the

(Continued on page 12)

The Church and Industry

(Continued from page 11)

end of the working day or in the evening more organized study and discussion is possible. There are groups of managers and of trade unionists meeting in most of our industrial centres under the auspices of an Industrial Mission. It can be argued that others could convene them — it may be true; the fact is that they don't; and in any case to meet under the umbrella of the Christian Church is to meet on neutral ground, which is never an unimportant consideration with industrial people. It is through such meetings that the Church discharges both its apostolate and diakonia.

The work reaches a further stage when residential conferences are organized. It is usual to bring together people from different levels of industry as well as industrial and theological speakers to discuss various aspects of Christian leadership in industry. Shortly before I visited South Africa I organized such a conference for a number of men who work in one of our largest companies. We went to a university for the week-end, and invited the Industrial Relations Director of another large company to join us and tell us how he saw the problems which industry must face. We also invited one of our most distinguished theological scholars to join us and tell us how any of the new theological thinking could deepen our discipleship at work. The theologian sat in on the industrialist's talk and vice-versa, in order to get the maximum cross-fertilization of ideas to help the conference members. The object of the exercise was to help lay people to understand the truth of the situations they stand in, industrially, to grasp the way in which Christianity discloses the truth and the resources which it deploys, in order that people may, each through their work and office, set forward the purpose of God in his creation.

As the work develops there are a number of opportunities for industrial chaplains to serve people in industry. They are often asked to take part in the training and education programmes of the companies with which they are associated. They may speak at trade union branches or in management

courses organized by consultants, or teach in colleges of technology. It depends upon interests and opportunities. To this should be added the pastoral work which comes the way of any clergy who move freely among people. It is written about in a short space but it requires much time to carry out.

ORGANIZATION

Thus Industrial Mission is a service which the Church renders to Industry both as a structure and as a people living within it. It is not a rescue operation which aims to lift them out of a factory into a parish hall. We must remember that parishes have their own missionary tasks. To expect industrial mission to do all is to beg a number of intractable sociological questions. This apostolate is discharged not by pulpit preaching but through the service given to industry and the catalytic action and conversation which this entails. Nevertheless, there is a benefit to the Church. Expert lay knowledge is mobilized, parish groups can be helped to restyle their study programmes, and clergy training can be assisted, by bringing to the students the best information about features of industrial life, which later as ministers they must face. We have found that Industrial Mission needs some national organization on an inter-church basis, because industry operates in units larger than that of a parish and it is not pre-occupied with denominational credentials. Many of our principal companies are national and inter-national rather than local or regional. Some means of moving along that industrial nervous system is needed in order to avoid the expenditure of needless energy and to minister to the whole structure of the organization. Most of the Churches in the United Kingdom have such a national organization; and a special responsibility lies upon the Church of England as the established church. Our committee, which is composed mainly of laymen working in industry, has found the development of national contacts with large companies to be essential for the work. It has striven to co-ordinate the Industrial Missions' ministry and develop it. Training courses, both for clergy and laity, have been set in hand; and through the local and national contacts an effort is made to serve the Church with the best thinking about industrial affairs.

UNITY AND CONTINUITY

No one Church possesses the resources for this task and in a disunited Christendom some demonstration of growing unity is necessary; especially as industry does not ask "Which denomination has the best credentials?" but "Is Christianity relevant in industrial life?" In the United Kingdom we have achieved a considerable degree of inter-church co-operation. A number of Industrial Mission teams are made up of ministers from a variety of denominations. It is not assumed that every Church must be willing to act before any one can take the initiative. The Churches have been prepared to accept one of their number to be the agent of all in a particular place; and have channelled their work through that Church. Work is not, however, initiated until there has been general consultation. We have learned by painful experience that unilateral action has disastrous consequences. But the work cannot wait. We have also learned that Industry will not take us seriously until we can demonstrate our own seriousness of intent. Normally that has to be done first of all by giving the industrial chaplains proper training, by setting up a continuous rather than an occasional ministry and then guaranteeing its continuity. Finally, we have learned the necessity of taking industry into our confidence by seeking their advice at every stage if this work is really to assist lay people in their discharge of their Christian responsibilities. And having got into industrial life, we have found that God has been there before us.

DETENTION WITHOUT TRIAL

At the Biennial Meeting of The Christian Council of South Africa held in June, the following resolution was unanimously adopted:

"The Christian Council of South Africa believing that the rule of law is being undermined by the present policy of banning and detention without trial, calls upon all Christians to consider this issue and its implications in the light of the Christian Gospel, and to exercise what influence they may possess to bring about a state of affairs in which justice shall be done and seen to be done."

ALL THINGS BRIGHT AND BEAUTIFUL

THE REV. JAMES E. MOULDER

According to *DIE VADERLAND* (18 June, 1966), Sen. Robert Kennedy asked Stellenbosch students what they are going to do if they discover God is Black. Apart from adding to the growing number of theological howlers committed by politicians in Southern Africa, this question provided the editor of *DIE KERKBODE* with an opportunity to pen a three sentence argument which is one of the most penetrating and perspicacious statements of what may be called a "theology of colour-consciousness". Here is the argument:

"The struggle against colour-consciousness is futile and a revolt against the facts as disposed of and created by God. It does not make sense to ask what colour the Creator is. It is a matter of fact that He has provided colour to His Creation and amongst people, and just as much as we ought not to idolize our own colour we also ought not to suggest that God acted thoughtlessly or arbitrarily when He gave mankind a coloured appearance."

The only weakness of this argument is that it is so compact and condenses such a wealth of information that its full significance may have escaped the attention of some. I want therefore to spell out the argument in more detail, convinced as I am that the editor of *Die Kerkbode* has succeeded in placing the theological problem of colour-consciousness on an unshakeable foundation. But first I must recast the argument so as to state explicitly the five propositions contained in the three sentences:

- (1) It does not make sense to ask what the Creator's colour is.
- (2) The whole of God's creation — that is, every astronomical, geological, botanical and zoological specimen, including *Homo sapiens* — has some colour or other because of the way in which he has created it.
- (3) The coloured appearance of men and women is a significant fact because God does not act thoughtlessly or arbitrarily.
- (4) It is futile and a revolt against the facts as created by God to struggle against colour-consciousness.

- (5) We ought not to idolize our own colour.

I comment on each of these propositions as follows:

BEYOND BLACK AND WHITE

It does not make sense to ask what the Creator's colour is. Being coloured is an observable property of created things, of the whole range of spatio-temporal objects, including men and women. But God is not a created thing — not an observable object in the spatio-temporal nexus. He is the Creator. Thus it does not make sense to suggest either that God has a particular colour like black or any other, or that he is colourless. The fact is, he transcends the coloured, spatio-temporal world which he created. Sen. Robert Kennedy must, therefore, have been joking or if he was serious needs to brush up his knowledge of Thomas Aquinas.

THE CREATOR OF COLOUR

The whole of God's creation has some colour or other because of the way in which he has created it. This proposition rests on a simple fact of experience — namely, that when we have some object or other — including some man or woman — under observation we notice, amongst other things, that what we are observing is coloured. Physicists and biochemists have discovered why this is so. **Firstly**, everything God created, including the human skin, flesh and bones, either emits or reflects electromagnetic radiations. Those electromagnetic radia-

tions within the very narrow waveband of $4.1 \times 10^{-5} \text{cm.}$ to $6.5 \times 10^{-5} \text{cm.}$ are those to which the retina of the human eye is sensitive. Because God has created us in this way, whenever we observe anything we become conscious of its colour. **Secondly**, biochemists have discovered how the colour of a man or woman's skin is determined. God has placed a black pigment (melanin) in the cytoplasm of the chromatophore cells which every human being has in his or her skin. The only exceptions are albinos who do not have any of the black pigment (melanin) in their skins which the rest of us have. The amount and distribution of this pigment, the thickness of the outer layer of cells and the blood in the vessels below the surface of the skin — plus the amount of sunlight in a country — are the ways in which God determines the colour of a man or woman's skin.

These then are the two ways in which God has worked and continues to work so that when one human being observes another he or she is aware of something beautifully coloured instead of colourless.

HUMILITY

The coloured appearance of men and women is a significant fact because God does not act thoughtlessly or arbitrarily. By now it should be obvious what *Die Kerkbode* wants us to do — namely, to reflect on the fact of our colour-consciousness when we observe a fellow creature of God's so that we may become aware of our own insignificance and God's greatness. Our insignificance arises from the fact that although the full range of all known electromagnetic radiations extends from 10^{-7} to 10^{15} metres, the human retina is only sensitive to the very narrow waveband of $4.1 \times 10^{-5} \text{cm.}$ to $6.5 \times 10^{-5} \text{cm.}$ Thus our total visual conception of the

(Continued on page 14)

All things bright and beautiful

(Continued from page 13)

universe which God has created — our total colour-consciousness — is limited to this small range. Furthermore if God had not placed the black pigment (melanin) in the cytoplasm of some of the cells in our skin we human beings would all be albinos instead of displaying the wide range of different colours which we do. And these same facts draw our attention to the greatness of the God who created us and who transcends these differences of colour and is free from the limitations our colour-consciousness imposes upon us. In these and many other ways God's "invisible attributes, that is to say his everlasting power and deity, have been visible, ever since the world began to the eye of reason, in the things he has made," (Romans 1:18-23). In short: God has so made us that every time we are conscious of another human being's colour a little reflection will remind us of our Creator's power and deity.

FUTILITY

It is futile and a revolt against the facts as created by God to struggle against colour-consciousness. I am not at all sure who Die Kerkbode had in mind when it issued this warning because I cannot imagine why anyone would want to "struggle against colour-consciousness". Given the facts about the way in which God has created us — that is, the electromagnetic waves to which our retinas are sensitive and the black pigment in some of the cells of our skins — none of us can observe any other one of us without being conscious of the other's colour. The only way in which we can "struggle against colour-consciousness" is to close our eyes or wear blinkers! This would indeed be a futile thing to do and someone who was as foolish as this could, I think, be said to be in revolt against the facts as created by God because of his or her refusal to acknowledge the beauty of God's colourful creation.

IDOLATRY

We ought not to idolize our own colour. The reasons for this warning

should by now be plain. I tabulate three of them:

1. Those who differentiate or discriminate between people on the basis of their skin-colour are as foolish as those who back race-horses on the basis of their colour. In fact the two kinds of foolishness arise from the same mistake — namely, that of thinking that the quantitative melanin differences in a man or a horse are more important than qualitative differences.

2. Only a little reflection is needed to recognise that if skin-colour differences are important then eye-colour and/or hair-colour differences should also be regarded as a valid basis for differentiating and discriminating between people because these eye and hair colour differences have also been created by God and have the same physical and biochemical basis as the skin-colour differences.

3. Colour-consciousness is a God-given reminder that he is the Creator of us all and that only the humble are accepted by him. Thus if anyone idolizes their own colour by regarding it as more important

than the colour of another "there is no possible defence for their conduct; knowing God, they have refused to honour him as God, or to render him thanks. Hence all their thinkings has ended in futility, and their misguided minds are plunged in darkness" (Romans 1:18-23).

ALL THINGS BRIGHT AND BEAUTIFUL

In case all this has been too academic, I want to conclude with some lines from a hymn by Cecil Frances Alexander which underlines the argument advanced by Die Kerkbode and serves as a song of praise for its "theology of colour-consciousness".

All things bright and beautiful,
All creatures great and small,
All things wise and wonderful,
The Lord God made them all . . .
He made their glowing colours . . .
He gave us eyes to see them,
And lips that we might tell
How great is God Almighty,
Who has made all things well.

LETTERS / BRIEVE

"GOD CALLED THE REFORMATION INTO BEING" — DR. COOK'S STATEMENT

QUESTIONED.

Mr. J. A. Duigan, Pretoria.

I accept that you are not responsible for non-editorial statements in PRO VERITATE but I wish to ask Revd. Dr. Calvin Cook, whose articles I have hitherto enjoyed, to change his declaration (PRO VERITATE, June) that "God called the Reformation into being", Jesus Christ who was doing the work of God, founded One Church in the year 33, and promised, "I shall be with you until the end of the world" — not, "until Martin Luther starts a Reformation"! As St. Ignatius said in 100 AD. "Where Jesus Christ is, there is the Catholic Church". Protestantism is simply an assertion that Christ has broken His promise to guide the Catholic Church.

I, and I am sure Dr. Cook also, have no wish to start a controversy, but the implication of his (Dr. Cook's) statement is that God was not satisfied with the Church started by His Son, and decided to start a Reformation in spite of His Son's promise, "I am with you always" (Mk. 28-20).

A reformation was necessary in the Catholic Church as regards internal discipline but not in teaching, and

this reformation was carried out by the Council of Trent in 1551, and by subsequent Decrees and Councils to date.

DR. COOK REPLIES

With due respect to Mr. Duigan, I cannot recant the statement he finds objectionable. There is indeed one church founded by Jesus Christ. No reformer has ever disputed this. If, in the providence of God part of the development of that church was that the Bishop of Rome came for a period to exercise supremacy, it was also part of that same providence that his monopoly ended in the East in 1054 and in the West in the 1520's. Either the supremacy and the ending are both part of the providence of God, or neither is. For neither was there at the beginning. The commission of Christ and his promise were made to all disciples. They hold for Mr. Duigan and for myself, as well as for everyone who has been baptized into Christ.

The formal principle of the Reformation was an appeal to the supremacy of the scriptures, that is, to the apostolic and prophetic foundation of the church. This appeal was necessary because not only the rule but the teaching office of the church had failed to maintain this witness. Since the questions raised were questions of truth, they could not be

settled as the papacy attempted at first, simply by an assertion of papal authority. For the papacy itself, the teachings by which it was supported were themselves under judgement. Belatedly Rome recognized this fact in the calling of the Council of Trent. By then, it was too late.

Mr. Duigan appears to make the mistake of equating the church with those who acknowledge Papal supremacy. There are no scriptural grounds for such a description of the church. Moreover, whatever the ecumenical degree of Vatican I may mean, it at least admits that through history (the sphere of God's providential action) the problem of ecclesiology has become more complicated than Mr. Duigan appears to admit.

I did not intend, and do not now make any comment on whether God is satisfied or dissatisfied with the church of His son. All I know is that this church is entered through repentance and faith, through rebirth and baptism by the Holy Spirit; it is sustained in its life by the same Spirit's critical and recreative work: *ubi Spiritus, ibi ecclesia*; and that this Spirit proceeds from the Father according to the un-failing promises of His son and bears true witness to him and his saving work, throughout the world. In none of these essential features does the question of the Bishop of Rome arise: the commission was given to preach this Gospel in Jerusalem, in all Judaea, in Samaria and in the uttermost parts of the world. Rome thus anonymously has its place along with the rest of this gracious providence.

* * *

CHRISTIAN RESPONSIBILITY AND HUMAN RIGHTS

Mr. D. Mason-Jones, Stellenbosch.

I was very interested in the letters on Human Rights and Christian responsibility in the May "Pro Veritate".

It would seem to me that Christian responsibility and human rights are very closely linked. As an example take Mathew 25:31-46, where Christ tells us of our *responsibility* to our fellow human-beings.

"For when I was hungry, you gave me food; when thirsty you gave me drink; when I was a stranger you took me into your home; when naked you clothed me; when I was ill you came to my help; when in prison you visited me."

Christ tells us everyone "one of my brothers here, however humble", has a *right* to food, home and comfort. Similarly when God commands us to "love thy neighbour as thyself" it is our *responsibility* to carry out this command. But at the same time it is the *right* of our neighbour to expect our love, and our *right* to expect the love of our neighbour. And when we ourselves or others are deprived of the *right* to a family life or are the victims of loveless thinking, then it is our *Christian responsibility* to strive for the fulfilment of these *human rights*.

Redaksioneel

AANVAL OP PROF. VAN SELMS

Die redaksie van **Pro Veritate** het kennis geneem van die felle reaksie in 'n Afrikaanse Sondagblad teen die artikel van prof. A. van Selms, „Kan ons met vuur speel?“, in ons uitgawe van 15 Julie.

Hoewel die redaksie nie noodwendig die menings onderskryf wat in ingestuurde artikels uitgespreek word nie, wil ons tog, wat die artikel van prof. Van Selms betref, verklaar dat die teologiese gesigspunte wat daarin na vore gebring is, ons volle instemming geniet. Ons deel met prof. Van Selms die oortuiging dat die Skrif alléén die bron van ons geloofskennis is. Geen volk mag aan sy geskiedenis, sy ras, sy taal, sy kultuur of enige ander volkseienendheid 'n openbaringsbetekenis toeskryf wat naas of in die plek van die Skrif gestel word nie. Ons oordeel daarom dat die kommentaar van prof. A. D. Pont (vgl. **Dagbreek en Sondagnuus**, 31 Julie 1966, Seksie 1, bl. 9: „Die vrae wat prof. Van Selms nou skielik as 'n selfgemaakte profeet vra, het ons Afrikaners al lankal onder oë gehad. Ons besef baie deeglik dat, gesien die geloftes van 1838 en 1880, God se bedoeling met ons volk beslis nog nie verwesenlik is en ons taak nog nie afgehandel is nie“) teologies onverantwoord is. As prof. Pont egter meen dat hy sy stelling wel kan verantwoord, dan verwag ons dat hy dit nader sal toelig. **Pro Veritate** sal sodanige nader toeligting graag publiseer.

Dieselfde geld vir ds. J. G. Griesel wat na aanleiding van prof. Van Selms se artikel opgemerk het: „Sy taal is die taal van 'n ongelowige en nie dié

van 'n gelowige nie . . . Vir my is die leiding van God in die geskiedenis van die Afrikaanse volk so duidelik dat ek niks anders kan sien as dat God wel 'n doel met die Suid-Afrikane:s het nie“ (vgl. **Dagbreek en Sondagnuus**, t.a.p.) Afgesien van die feit dat dit onbillik is van ds. Griesel om sy oordeel blykbaar te vel op grond van wat prof. Van Selms nie gesê het nie (in die artikel word nêrens beweer dat God nie 'n doel met die Afrikanervolk het nie) — waaruit ons sterk vermoed dat hy die artikel self nie gelees het nie — sal ons graag van ds. Griesel wil hoor hoe hy dit teologies verantwoord om 'n bepaalde waardering van die geskiedenis van die Afrikanervolk te wil stel as 'n maatstaf ter onderskeiding tussen die taal van die geloof en die taal van die ongelof.

Ten slotte wil ons verklaar dat ons dit betreur dat in die genoemde politieke orgaan, met 'n klaarblyklike onbevoegdheid om die artikel van prof. Van Selms te beoordeel, beweer word dat prof. Van Selms twyfel oor die „Christelike bestaansreg“ van die Afrikanervolk probeer wek. In hierdie bewering, wat daarop bereken is om die openbare mening tot verset aan te wakker, word die waarheid geweld aangedoen. Om die bestaansreg van die Afrikanervolk te betwyfel is iets totaal anders as om uit die Skrif kritiese vrae waarskuwend voor te hou aan 'n denkrigting wat uit die Afrikanervolk se ontstaan en geskiedenis as sodanig meen te verklaar dat die raad van God t.o.v. die Afrikanervolk deursigtig is.

GOD — NEDERLAND — ORANJE

In die Nederlandse maandblad, *Libertas ex Veritate*, April 1966, is die volgende gesprek weergegee wat ons interessantheidshalwe vir ons lesers (in Afrikaans) herhaal. Die deelnemers was Thijs Booy, voormalige privaatskrywer van H.M. Koningin Wilhelmina, Benjamin van Kaam, redakteur van *Trouw* (Amsterdam) en Han Lammers, redakteur van *De Gids*. Die gesprek het gegaan oor die vraag: "Is de Gereformeerde wereld veranderd?" en o.m. is daar menings gewissel oor die vraag: Wat is julle hedendaagse reaksie by die aanhoor of lees van die ou slagspreuk GOD — NEDERLAND — ORANJE, en wat is die agtergrond van julle reaksie? Dit het so verloop:

Lammers: Dit vind ek die mooiste vraag.

Ek het agterna eers goed begryp, al is ek opgevoed met daardie „drievoudige snoer wat nooit verbreek sou word nie“, dat die (Anti) Rewolusionêre Party heeltemal geen prinsipiële voorkeur het vir monargie of republiek nie. Die gebruik van die kreet GOD — NEDERLAND — ORANJE vind ek nou 'n tipiese voorbeeld van hoe 'n kerk of 'n klub met goeie ideale (want ek sien 'n kerk nog altyd as 'n klub met goeie ideale) hom kan verburgerlik deur identifikasie met die *status quo*.

Van Kaam: Die kreet GOD — NEDERLAND — ORANJE is gelukkig nooit heeltemal verwerk in die Gereformeerde volksdeel nie. Daar het in die aanvaarding van hierdie spreuk altyd 'n spanningsmoment gebly. In hierdie spreuk lê daar origens vir my gevoel alles opgesluit wat 'n mens mishaag en teenstaan in die tipiese *Gereformeerde geskiedenis*: die neerle van jouself by die eenmaal heersende orde. Ek herinner my nog as jong seun, 'n Mens het gevoel of jy 'n deel uitmaak van 'n uitverkore deel van 'n uitverkore volk in 'n uitverkore wêrelddeel, bevolk met mense van 'n uitverkore ras.

Booy: Ek het tog altyd wel 'n bietjie medelye gehad met die arme nie-uitverkorenes.

Van Kaam: Ons as Gereformeerdes het gevoel soos die silwer balletjie op die roomkoekie; en daardie roomkoekie het nou heeltemal inmekaar gesak. Dit is teleurstellend en bevrydend. Ons voel ons nou eindelijk een met die soveel miljoene in die hele wêreld.

Snaaks tog dat elke Christelike volk hom vroeër of later min of meer as die spesiale Volk van die Here, een of ander *Israel*, beskou. Nie alleen ons nie, maar ook Italië, Duitsland, Spanje, Engeland en selfs Amerika.

Booy: Miskien alleen die Luxemburgse volk nie! Dan is dit miskien weer

die voordeel daarvan om 'n klein landjie te wees.

Van Kaam: Ek dink aan 'n ander spreuk, waarmee Malan in Suid-Afrika gewerk het: Glo in God, glo in jou volk, glo in jouself. Dit is ook iets soos GOD — NEDERLAND — ORANJE. Prof. A. van Selms het die spreuk van Suid-Afrika gelukkig afgebreek, en sowaar met 'n verwysing na die gevaar verbonde aan ons GOD — NEDERLAND — ORANJE.

Was dit ook nie die sonder, die kernsonde van die volk Israel nie? Selfs die dissipels het daar moete mee gehad. Hulle trits was: GOD — JESUS — ISRAEL.

Booy: Ja, hulle was in diskussie oor wie die aanstaande Eerste Minister sou wees: natuurlik was dit Jesus! Maar hulle het hulle tewens afgevra: Sal Petrus nou „Finansies“ kry of Andreas?

Ek kan oor die gestelde vraag origens verder heel kort wees. In hierdie soort Oranjenistiek het ek nooit geglo nie, en ek meen dat ek my daarby in goeie geselskap bevind het soos dit vir my later geblyk het, nl. dié van Koningin Wilhelmina. Ek het haar eenmaal gevra hoe sy gedink het oor ons GOD — NEDERLAND — ORANJE. Sy het geantwoord: „Die kreet was goed bedoel maar onsuiver“.

Book Review

EDUCATIONIST'S DEPRESSING PICTURE OF RACE PREJUDICE IN WHITE SCHOOLS

'The Power of Prejudice in South African Education', F. E. Auerbach, (A. A. Balkema, 1965, 131 pp. Indexed. R2.50).

It is significant that two distinguished English-speaking educationists in the Transvaal should have recently published books on racial prejudice in education.

In 'Prejudice in the Classroom', published by the Institute of Race Relations (see *Race Relations News* for May), Eleanor Hawarden deals with the subject in general terms, while Mr. Auerbach's book is a specific enquiry into high school history text-books and syllabuses in the Transvaal.

Mr. Auerbach sets out to test Professor Joseph Lauwerys's assertion that education in South Africa is used to divide our people. He limits himself to white schools in the Transvaal and does not examine the effects of 'Bantu education', or for that matter Indian and Coloured education.

TEXT-BOOKS

The investigation is thorough, scholarly, and convincing, and the conclusions are depressing.

In translated text-books the English versions often differ substantially and significantly from the Afrikaans: 'In the latter there is considerably more prejudice against a large number of out-groups' (Roman Catholics, Missionaries, Africans, Muslims, Indians, etc.).

Certain commonly used text-books concentrate to an exaggerated extent on South African history, and on certain episodes, while world history receives insufficient attention.

DISTORTED PICTURE

Certain writers of school history text-books, particularly in Afrikaans, give distorted impressions of historical events, so that they tend to fit in with a particular nationalistic and racialistic point of view. They do this through the use of emotive language, through the omission of significant information, and through falsification.

There is 'a pronounced trend to greater ethnocentrism, embodied in certain Afrikaans text-books only' and this trend 'has been influenced by the philosophy of Christian National Education'.

EXAGGERATED IDEA

One danger is that white children 'are likely to obtain an exaggerated idea of the relative importance of the history of South Africa within the history of civilisation, and more especially are likely to be imbued with the erroneous belief that Africans are permanently tribal and inherently inferior to whites and that Western civilisation and Christianity are racially linked with people of white or Caucasian

stock'. In short, Professor Lauwerys was right.

It must be stressed that Mr. Auerbach does not reach these, and other, conclusions lightly, but only as a result of extremely careful and painstaking research; his methods are cautious and even hesitant, and his findings are fully documented.

Having satisfied himself as to the true position, the author offers suggestions on how to effect changes that are obviously needed, and discusses the consequences of allowing the present position to continue unchecked.

He quotes Dr. E. G. Malherbe: 'Though Hitler lost the war, he won the peace in South Africa with his emphasis on blood and race'.

Although he offers practical suggestions for such things as text-book revision, Mr. Auerbach is not optimistic: 'Perhaps it is too late; it may be that the tensions engendered by excessive emphasis on group loyalty and interest are such that we are set irrevocably on a collision course'.

It is, however, worth doing everything possible to avert disaster, and one small thing that can be done is to get educationists, student teachers and parents to pay serious attention to this book.

P.R.

(Reprinted from *Race Relations News*. By kind permission of the South African Institute of Race Relations).