



# PRO VERITATE

*H. HÄSELBARTH*

*Via Crucis*

*C. J. LABUSCHAGNE*

*Wie Meen dat hy Staan, moet Oppas...*

*CALVIN COOK*

*From Breakwater to Open Sea*

*DAVID PERK*

*The Verkrampes*

*Volume VI, No. 5 | Jaargang VI, No. 5*

*15 September 1967*

# PRO VERITATE

CHRISTIAN MONTHLY FOR SOUTHERN AFRICA  
CHRISTELIKE MAANDBLAD VIR SUIDELIKE AFRIKA

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

## EDITORIAL

### EDITOR:

Dr. B. Engelbrecht.

### EDITORIAL COMMITTEE:

Bishop B. B. Burnett; Rev. J. de Gruchy; Rev. A. W. Habelgaarn; Rev. E. E. Mahabane; Rev. J. E. Moulder; Rev. C. F. B. Naudé (Chairman); Rev. R. Orr; Prof. Dr. A. van Selms.

## ADMINISTRATION/ CORRESPONDENCE

### CIRCULATION MANAGER:

Dr. W. B. de Villiers.

All letters to the editor and administration to: P.O. Box 487, Johannesburg.

## SUBSCRIPTION

Subscription payable in advance.

Land and sea mail: R1 (10/- or \$1.40) — Africa; R1.50 (15/- or \$2.10) — Overseas.

Air mail: R2 (£1 or \$2.80) — Africa; R3.50 (£1.17.6 or \$5.00) — Overseas.

Cheques and postal orders to be made payable to Pro Veritate (Pty.) Ltd., P.O. Box 487, Johannesburg.

## PLEASE NOTE

The editorial staff of Pro Veritate state herewith that they are not responsible for opinions and standpoints which appear in any article of this monthly other than those in the editorial and editorial statements.

PRO VERITATE appears on the 15th of every month.

(Price per single copy 10c).

## IN THIS ISSUE . . .

- The Rev. H. Häselbarth of the Lutheran Theological College, Mapumulo, writes about the public dimension of the way of the Cross for South African Christians. . . . P. 4
- Dr. C. J. Labuschagne adjudges the eulogy of the qualities of aplomb and determination, which are so highly esteemed in our country, as theologically dangerous. . . . P. 6
- Dr. Calvin Cook tells of the inauguration of the "University Christian Movement" on the 14th July, 1967. . . . P. 9
- We shall always have the "verkramptes" with us, says David Perk. How should we evaluate their presence and attitude? P. 11
- Prof. B. B. Keet gives a review of the reactions of various church groups with regard to the situation in the Middle East. . . . P. 12
- The Rev. Derrick Norman continues his discussion of the subject of evangelism as the "socialisation of grace". . . . P. 14

## IN HIERDIE UITGAWE

- Eerw. H. Häselbarth van die Lutherse Teologiese Kollege te Mapumulo skryf oor die publieke dimensie van die weg van die kruis vir Suid-Afrikaanse Christene. . . . Bl. 4
- Dr. C. J. Labuschagne bespreek die teologiese bedanklikheid van die aanprysing van die eienskappe van selfversekerdheid en vaseradenheid wat in ons land so hoog geskat word. . . . Bl. 6
- Dr. Calvin Cook vertel van die stigting van die "University Christian Movement" op 14 Julie 1967. . . . Bl. 9
- Ons sal die „verkramptes" altyd by ons hê, sê David Perk. Hoe moet ons hulle aanwasigheid en optrede beoordeel? . . . Bl. 11
- Prof. B. B. Keet gee 'n oorsig van die reaksie van verskillende kerkgroepe tot die situasie in die Midde-Ooste. . . . Bl. 12
- Eerw. Derrick Norman gaan voort met sy bespreking van die onderwerp van evangelisasie as die „sosialisering" van die gade. . . . Bl. 14

Editorial:

## "Verkrampste" and "Verligte" Heresy

It is foreign to the nature of **Pro Veritate** to take part in the mudslinging contest according to whose rules smear epithets are flung at people on account of some conviction or other held by them. We regard the word "**verkramp**" (ultra narrow-minded) as such a smear epithet. It is a word which had better never been coined — an unnecessary and unfortunate addition to the vocabulary of invectives with which the Afrikaans language is hardly ill endowed. The word has an offensive sound, and, in what it seeks to describe, it also has in fact an offensive connotation.

We must admit however, that some good may flow from the spiritual controversy which gave birth to this swear-word. But the condition is that something should dawn upon the particular politico-cultural circle within which the **verlig-verkramp** controversy has taken place (a politico-cultural circle which calls itself Christian National by preference and which constantly makes acceptance of the ideology of racial **apartheid** the absolute condition for whomsoever wishes to seek or retain shelter under its wings): the realisation that the principle around which the whole controversy among brethren swirls, viz. uninhibited difference of opinion within the confines of acceptance of the ideology, still possesses a further dimension.

What is actually necessary for South Africa's salvation is not only that a mutual difference of opinion be allowed among those who believe in **apartheid**, but that room should also be made for witness from God's Word. And this means, by definition, that it should be recognised that not only "Christian Nationalism", sheltered by its belief in **apartheid**, dare enjoy a right to existence in South African life, but that room should also be left for the truth, i.e. of God's Word.

With this we do not mean the (existing!) formal right of any church, organisation, person or publication to proclaim the truth in accordance with his or its own vision, taking into account the repercussions (ridicule suspicion mongering, ostracism). What is essentially at stake is **public reverence** for the testimony of Scripture, and ipso facto therefore **public recognition** of the utter rejectability of the whole ideology of **apartheid** as heresy.\*

For here, ultimately, it is no longer a matter of difference of opinion. It is the truth and the lie which here confront each other. And it is obviously a somewhat ironical situation if the truth has to start pleading for a right to existence. In reality it should demand it.

There is authority in the truth. In it there is a force which dethrones the lie, judges it, sets it aside. There is in the truth an essential intolerance towards the lie. And yet it is ostensibly part of the nature of truth as it appears in this world that it frequently, mostly (or always?) acts pleadingly, like the Spirit himself — that it suffers oppression and has to struggle for its very existence.

In any case, in South Africa room **dare not** only be provided for a difference of opinion within the exclusive sphere of an unconditional acceptance of **apartheid**. It **dare not** be the case that the doctrine of apartheid delimits the boundaries within which the "narrow-minded" and "enlightened" may still confront each other as good, Christian National Afrikaners. Room **must** be provided for the Word, for truth itself, for the radical contradiction of the belief in **apartheid** as such. And as long as this has not yet been attained, nothing of real value will have been attained with the **verlig-verkramp** controversy; acceptance of the "basic formulae" of the ideology as a condition of what may pass as admissible differences of opinion will in itself represent "narrow-mindedness" i.e. "verkramptheid" (pardon the phrase) of the worst nature. This is what heretofore we have called the "further dimension" of the principle which is being defended in the Christian National politico-cultural circle of which the doctrine of **apartheid** is the basis.

The whole structure of apartheid, in whose upper reaches steadily more "enlightened" views are being held, rests upon a spiritual foundation of quasi-Biblical doctrines which, although probably designated as "**verkramp**" in Christian National terminology, must bluntly be called heresy in the real language of the Church.

He who has sold his soul to this ideology and has accepted **apartheid** as the basis of his view of life and the world — however "**verlig**" his views may be — must be confronted with this fact. In this South African ideology we are not just dealing with something which is merely designed as a practical arrangement of human relations on a universally accredited Biblical basis, but with a pretentious doctrine of salvation which claims, like all pseudo gospels (Communism, for instance!), to be bringing the world the true tidings concerning its salvation.

This statement is confirmed by our Prime Minister's recent pronouncement that South Africa (with its policy of **apartheid**) possesses the solution for the problems of the world. For all true believers the increasing claims to salvation by **apartheid**, however enlightened the views held by some of its devotees may be, must be so much more disquieting at the thought that the heresy on which they are based has never yet been exorcised. What it amounts to basically is that, whilst this ideology remains the delimitation of the exclusive sphere within which different opinions ranging from **verkramp** to **verlig** may be held, room has been made for nothing more than for a "**verligte**" heresy next to a "**verkrampste**" heresy.

**Apartheid** with its claim to being both Christian and containing the secret of racial peace in the world would never have become the gospel of South Africa if the Church had clearly and persistently kept on proclaiming the witness — and political leaders had taken notice of it — that only the one and eternal

gospel of the reconciliation in Christ dare lay claim to such a meaning of salvation, also for South Africa.

Fortunately it is not true that **apartheid** has become the faith of all South Africa. There are still those who realise that **apartheid** can only be believed in as the basis for human relations and the guarantee of our salvation at the cost of a total surrender of Jesus and his expiatory sacrifice. There are still those who know that the heretical sub-structure of this ideology can be demolished with the power of the Christian gospel and that the whole structure will then collapse like a house of cards.

Then, and then only, we shall be able to start building anew on the rock which is Christ as our sole foundation.

If the Church could only bring itself clearly to realise and state that the ideology of **apartheid** and the Biblical vision of faith are two beliefs which radically exclude each other; that the gospel of **apartheid** is the absolute opposite of the gospel of reconciliation; that the first is rooted in nature and therefore heathenish, whilst the second is rooted in revelation and that it alone can lay claim to being Christian; if the Church could come so far as to draw the right line between truth and error; if it could discern and chastise the perversion of the doctrine that creation, Babel, Pentecost, Acts 17:26 etc. imply the divine commandment of **apartheid** — then the whole ideology of **apartheid** would be undermined at the base.

If in South Africa there could only be brought about an understanding of and belief in the cross of Christ in its full salvatory significance it would spell the end of the gospel of **apartheid** — inevitably and irresistibly. Then the future will be light for us and not dark. Belief in the divine gospel is necessary for the enlightenment of the enlightened and the uncramping of cramped souls.

The gospel of Jesus Christ alone is the hope and salvation of South Africa.

For it remains an abomination that prophesies our doom to call an ideology — whether **verlig** or **verkrampt** — which contradicts this gospel at its core, Christian, and to use it for lying purposes by robbing the one and only gospel of its promises and projecting them into it.

Room must be made in our country for the unadulterated Word.

\* **Pro Veritate** is at times accused of a critical obsession with "apartheid", the impression being that it repeatedly condemns the whole policy as such without also noticing its praiseworthy aspects. We are not, however, concerned with the political policy in the first place, but with the pseudo-evangelical ideology which is ever more regularly being absolutised as basis of this policy. By way of providing an unequivocal exposition of our standpoint we submit the following:

**Pro Veritate** does not hold the view that the only alternative for **apartheid** in South Africa is an enforced political and social integration. The ordering and arrangement of our multi-racial society on the basis of the gospel of reconciliation is the alternative for both the possibilities mentioned. Only upon the basis of this gospel is a responsible, peaceful co-existence of all men in our country possible. Only through the acceptance of this gospel as the basis for the ordering of our national life shall we escape from both a rigid **apartheid** legislation which is the logical result of the unscriptural principle of **apartheid** as norm of our view of life and the world, and from a loveless, revolutionary compulsion towards integration, with the hardships both of them inevitably entail. Only the "principle" of reconciliation is vital and adaptable enough to be applied in a multi-racial country like South Africa as the ordering principle of society. Otherwise it will inevitably lead to a clash between irreconcilables.

There are two extremes which are unthinkable in a political and social arrangement of life on the basis of reconciliation: on the one hand, that a principle of separation should apply which is ever more strictly enforced by legislation; and, on the other, that a principle of integration should apply which would be enforced by legislation upon all men on all levels of society. Neither consistent, absolute **apartheid** nor consistent, absolute integration is either a reality or realistic politics in South Africa. The former strives to transform the natural differences between men, and specifically those differences which relate to the fact that there exists a variety of races, into eternal barriers; the latter apparently wants to negate these differences. In either case elements of civilization play but a minor rôle, if any.

On the basis of reconciliation neither the one nor the other occurs but it becomes possible for man to respect the otherness of his fellow-man and his fellow-man in his otherness — not to negate it, therefore, nor to deduce from it a compulsory natural law of "apartheid" — and to find in the very respect for his otherness the possibility and opportunity for co-existence, and fellowship. Where reconciliation applies, the non-similarity of men is directed towards, is even the presupposition of, their life in relationship. Only upon the basis of the Christian gospel can both — the non-similarity and the communality — be maintained. The "heresy" of an ideology of integration denies the non-similarity; the "heresy" of the ideology of **apartheid** denies the communality.

It is clear that it would have far-reaching results for the whole political and social structure in South Africa if the gospel of reconciliation were to become its basis. Numerous **apartheid** regulations would go by the board if **apartheid** as ideology were to be relinquished. This would not mean, however, that certain **apartheid** regulations which are obviously good and necessary would have to be jettisoned and that this would necessarily lead to such a pattern of integration as is feared by the protagonists of **apartheid** or is desired by the fanatics of a revolutionary politics of integration.

The "body of Christ" (I Cor. 12:12f.) would have to serve as example for such a political and social order — not only on the level of its individual members, but also on the level of elements of the population and national groups which constitute the people of South Africa. Within it a beneficial togetherness and communality will, on the one hand, find expression (we prefer to avoid the word "integration") whilst, on the other an equally beneficial variety and separateness (which is not identical with the "apartheid" of the ideology of **apartheid**) will be acknowledged.

We realise that we have not hereby spoken the final word, nor do we profess to be able to do so. Yet we are sincerely convinced that a principle of **apartheid** is totally rejectable in the light of Scripture as spiritual basis for the ordering of the community, and that we have at least given a clear indication of the lines along which, in our opinion, the discussion should be conducted concerning the only truly Christian approach to our country's problem. In the ideology of **apartheid** we have to do with something which deeply affects every Christian in our country and which places nothing less at stake than our claim to be Christians.

#### Inleidingsartikel:

## „Verkrampte” en „Verligte” Kettery

Dit is vreemd aan **Pro Veritate** om mee te doen aan die gerondslinger van skeldwoorde waarmee smeertitels aan mense toegeken word op grond van een of ander oortuiging wat deur hulle gehuldig word. Die woord „verkrampt” beskou ons as so 'n smeertitel. Dit is 'n woord wat liever nooit versin moes gewees het nie — 'n onnodige en ongelukkige toevoeging tot 'n vloekwoordeskat waaraan die Afrikaanse taal nie juis arm is nie. Die woord het 'n kwetsende klank, en met wat dit wil beskrywe het dit inderdaad ook 'n kwetsende bedoeling.

Ons moet egter wel erken dat daar uit die gedagtestryd waarin daar aan hierdie vloek-term geboorte gegee is, op die duur iets goeds mag voortkom. Die voorwaarde is egter dat daar in die betrokke politiek-kulturele kring waarin die verlig-verkrampt kontrovers plaasgevind het — 'n politiek-kulturele kring wat homself by voorkeur Christelikenasionaal noem en die onderskrywing van die rasse-apartheidsideologie steeds as absolute voorwaarde stel vir wie ook al 'n plek onder sy koepel wil hê of behou — die besef sal begin posvat dat

die saak waarvoor daar in sy eie geleedere gestry word, nl. vrye meningsverskil binne die grense van die aanvaarding van die ideologie, nog 'n ander dimensie het.

Wat vir Suid-Afrika inderdaad heilsnoodsaaklik is, is nie slegs dat daar onder die apartheidsbelyers onderling verskil van mening mag bestaan nie, maar dat daar ruimte sal kom vir die getuïenis uit Gods Woord. En dit beteken, per definisie, dat daar 'n erkenning moet kom dat daar in die Suid-Afrikaanse lewe nie slegs bestaansreg mag wees vir 'n „Christelike nasionalisme” wat deur die apartheids-geloof oorkoepel word nie, maar dat daar ook ruimte gelaat moet word vir die waarheid, nl. van Gods Woord.

Daarmee bedoel ons nie die (bestaandel!) formele reg van enige kerk, organisasie, persoon of blad om, met berekening van die gevolge (bespotting, verdagmaking, ostrasisme) die waarheid, soos dit ingesien mag word, uit te spreek nie. Dit gaan wesenlik om die **openbare eerbiediging** van die Skrifgetuïenis, en daarom ipso facto om die **publieke erkenning** van die radikale verwerplikeheid van die hele apartheidsideologie as kettery.\*

Ons het hier tog eintlik nie meer met meningsverskil te doen nie. Dit is waarheid en leuen wat hier teenoor mekaar staan. En dit is klaarblyklik 'n ietwat ironiese situasie as die waarheid om sy bestaansreg moet begin pleit. Eintlik moet hy dit opeis.

Daar is gesag in die waarheid. Daar is in die waarheid die geweld wat die leuen onttron, oordeel, ter syde stel. Daar is 'n wesenlike intoleransie in die waarheid ten opsigte van die leuen. En tog lê dit blykbaar in die aard van die waarheid soos dit in hierdie wêreld verskyn, dat dit dikwels, meestal (of altyd?) pleitend optree, soos die Gees self — dat dit in verdrukking kom en om bestaansreg moet worstel.

Hoe dit ook sy, in Suid-Afrika mag daar nie slegs ruimte wees vir meningsverskil binne die eksklusiewe sfeer van 'n onvoorwaardlike apartheidsaanvaarding nie. Dit mag nie so wees dat die apartheidsdogma die ruimte omlin waarbinne „verkramp” en „verlig” nog as goeie, Christelik-nasionale Afrikaners teenoor mekaar kan staan nie. Daar moet ruimte kom vir die Woord, vir die waarheid self, vir die radikale weerspreking van die apartheids-geloof as sodanig. En so lank dit nog nie bereik is nie, is daar met die hele verlig-verkramp kontrovers in wese nog niks bereik nie; is die onderskrywing van die „basisformules” van die ideologie as voorwaarde vir wat nog as toelaatbare meningsverskil mag geld, self 'n „verkramptheid” (vergewe die woord) van die ergste graad. Dit is wat ons hierbo genoem het die „ander dimensie” van die saak waarvoor daar in die Christeliek-nasionale politiek-kulturele kring, waarvan die apartheidsdogma die basis is, gepleit word.

Die hele apartheidstruktuur, in die bowe-ruimte waarvan daar steeds „verligter” beskouinge gehuldig word, rus op 'n geestelike grondslag van quasi-Bybelse leerstellings wat, (waarskynlik as „verkramp” aangedui in die Christeliek-nasionale terminologie), in egte kerktal onomwonde as kettery bestempel moet word.

Wie sy hart aan hierdie ideologie verpand het en apartheid as grondslag vir sy lewens- en wêreldbeskouing aanvaar het — hoe „verlig” sy beskou-

inge ook al mag wees — moet met hierdie feit gekonfronteer word. Ons het in dié Suid-Afrikaanse ideologie nie maar met iets te doen wat 'n bloot praktiese reëling wil wees van menslike verhoudinge op 'n universeel aanvaarde Bybelse grondslag nie, maar met 'n pretensieuse heilsleer wat soos alle pseudo-evangelies (die Kommunisme, bv.!) daarop aanspraak maak om vir die wêreld die waarheidsboodskap van sy redding te bring.

Die onlangse uitspraak van ons Eerste Minister dat Suid-Afrika (met sy apartheidsbeleid) die oplossing het vir die probleme van die wêreld, staaf hierdie stelling. Vir alle ware gelowiges moet die toenemende heilsaansprake van apartheid, watter verligte idees sommige van sy belyers ook al mag huldig, des te verontrustender wees by die gedagte dat die kettery wat daaraan ten grondslag lê, nog nooit besweer is nie. In die grond van die saak kom dit daarop neer dat, waar hierdie ideologie die omgrensing bly van die eksklusiewe ruimte waarbinne meningsverskille wat wissel van verkramp tot verlig gehuldig mag word, daar vir nog niks meer ruimte gekom het nie as vir „verligte” kettery naas „verkrampte” kettery.

Apartheid sou nooit die evangelie van Suid-Afrika geword het met die pretensie dat dit sowel Christelik is as dat dit die heilsgeheim bevat vir rassevrede in die wêreld, as die kerk duidelik en volhardend die getuïenis bly uitspreek het — en politieke leiers daarop ag gegee het — dat slegs die enige en ewige evangelie van die versoening in Christus op so 'n heilsbetekenis ook vir Suid-Afrika, mag aanspraak maak nie.

Gelukkig is dit nie waar dat apartheid die geloof van gans Suid-Afrika geword het nie. Daar is nog diegene wat besef dat apartheid slegs met 'n totale prysgawe van Jesus en sy versoeningsoffer as die grondslag vir menslike verhoudinge en die waarborg vir ons heil geglo kan word. Daar is nog diegene wat weet dat die ketterse onderbou van hierdie ideologie met die krag van die Christelike evangelie afgebreek kan word en dat die hele struktuur dan soos 'n kaarthuis sal intuimel.

Dan en eers dan, sal ons op die rots Christus as ons enigste fondament, opnuut kan begin.

As die kerk maar daartoe kan kom om dit duidelik in te sien en uit te spreek dat die apartheidsideologie en die Bybelse geloofsvisionen twee gelowe is wat mekaar radikaal uitsluit; dat die evangelie van apartheid die absolute teendeel van die evangelie van versoening is; dat die eerste in die natuur gewortel en daarom heidens is terwyl die tweede in die openbaring gewortel is en dít alleen as Christelik kan geld; as die kerk daartoe kan kom om die regte skeidslyn tussen waarheid en dwaling te trek; as hy die perversie kan insien en bestraf van die leer dat die skepping, Babel, Pinkster, Hand. 17:26, ens. die goddelike wil en gebod van apartheid impliseer — dan is die hele apartheidsideologie in sy fundamente ondermyn.

As die kruis van Christus maar in sy volle heilsbetekenis in Suid-Afrika verstaan en geglo word, sal dit die einde van die evangelie van apartheid wees — onvermydelik en onkeerbaar. Dan sal die toekoms vir ons lig wees en nie donker nie. Die geloof in die goddelike evangelie is nodig tot die verligting van die verligtes en die ontkramping van die verkrampes.

Alleen die evangelie van Jesus Christus is die hoop en heil van Suid-Afrika.

Want — verlig of verkramp — dit bly 'n gruwel wat ons ondergang voorspel om 'n ideologie wat hierdie evangelie in sy kern weerspreek, Christelik te noem en daarmee te lieg deur die beloftes van die één, enige evangelie daarvoor te roof en daarin te projekteer.

Daar moet in ons land ruimte kom vir die onvervalste Woord.

\* **Pro Veritate** word van tyd tot tyd beskuldig van 'n kritiese beheptheid met „apartheid” as sou hy telkens weer die hele beleid voor die voet veroordeel sonder om ook die aanprysenswaardige aspekte daarvan raak te sien. Dit gaan vir ons egter nie in eerste instansie om die politieke beleid nie, maar wel om die pseudo-evangeliese ideologie wat al hoe meer as grondslag van hierdie beleid verabsoluteer word. Om ons standpunt onduublings uit te sit, die volgende:

**Pro Veritate** huldig nie die beskouing dat die enigste alternatief vir apartheid in Suid-Afrika 'n geforseerde politieke en sosiale integrasie is nie. 'n Ordening en inrigting van ons veelrassige samelewing op die grondslag van die evangelie van versoening is die alternatief vir albei die genoemde moontlikhede. Slegs op die grondslag van hierdie evangelie is 'n verantwoordelike, vreedsame saambestaan van alle mense in ons land moontlik. Slegs deur die aanvaarding van hierdie evangelie as die grondslag vir die inrigting van ons volkslewe sal ons ontkom aan sowel 'n starre apartheidswetgewing wat die logiese uitvloeisel is van die Skrifteenstrydige beginsel van apartheid as norm van ons lewens- en wêreldbeskouing, as aan 'n liefdelose, rewolusionêre integrasiedwang, met al die ellende wat beide onvermydelik meebring. Slegs die „beginsel” van die versoening is lewend en beweeglik genoeg om in 'n veelrassige land soos Suid-Afrika te geld as ordeningsprinsipe van die samelewing. Anders gaan dit onvermydelik lei tot 'n botsing van onversoenlikhede.

In 'n politieke en maatskaplike ordening van die lewe op die grondslag van die versoening is daar twee uiterstes wat ondenkbaar is: Enersyds dat die beginsel van skeiding sal geld wat deur wetgewing steeds strenger toegepas word; en andersyds dat 'n beginsel van saamvoeging sal geld wat deur wetgewing op alle vlakke van die samelewing en op alle mense afdwing wil word. Nóg konsekwente, absolute apartheid nóg

konsekwente, absolute integrasie is óf 'n realiteit óf realistiese politiek in Suid-Afrika. Eersgenoemde wil die natuurlike verskille tussen mense, m.n. daardie verskille wat saamhang met die feit dat daar 'n verskeidenheid van rasse bestaan, tot ewige skeidsure opbou; laasgenoemde wil blykbaar hierdie verskille negeer. By albei speel beskawingsfaktore 'n onbeduidende rol, indien enige.

Op die grondslag van die versoening geskied nóg die een nóg die ander maar word dit vir die mens moontlik om die anders-wees van sy medemens en sy medemens in sy andersheid te eerbiedig — dus nie om dit te negeer nie; ook nie om daaruit 'n dwingende natuurwet van „apartheid” af te lei nie — en juis in die eerbiediging van sy anders-wees die moontlikheid en die geleentheid te vind tot samelewing, medemenslikheid. Die nie-eendersheid van mense is, waar die versoening geld, gerig op, en is selfs die veronderstelling van, hulle lewe in gemeenskap. Slegs op die grondslag van die Christelike evangelie kan albei — die nie-eendersheid en die gemeenskaplikheid — gehandhaaf word. Die „kettery” van 'n integrasie-ideologie ontken die nie-eendersheid; die „kettery” van die apartheidsideologie ontken die gemeenskaplikheid.

Dat dit vir die hele politieke en sosiale struktuur in Suid-Afrika verreikende gevolge sal hê indien die evangelie van versoening die grondslag daarvan sal wees, is duidelik. Talle apartheidsmatreeëls sal verval as apartheid as ideologie losgelaat word. Dit sal egter nie beteken dat sekere apartheidsmatreeëls wat voor die hand liggend goed en noodsaaklik is, oorboord gewerp moet word en dat dit tot so 'n patroon van integrasie moet lei soos wat deur apartheidsvoorstanders gevrees of deur fanatici van 'n rewolusionêre integrasiepolitiek begeer word nie.

Die „liggaam van Christus” (1 Kor. 12:12v) sal vir so 'n politieke en maatskaplike ordening as voorbeeld moet dien — nie slegs op die vlak van die individuele lede nie, maar ook op die vlak van bevolkingselemente en volksgroepe waaruit die volk van Suid-Afrika saamgestel is. Daarin sal enersyds 'n heilsame saamverbondenheid en gemeenskaplikheid tot uitdrukking kom (ons vermy hier die woord „integrasie”) terwyl andersyds noodwendig ook 'n ewe heilsame verskeidenheid en afsonderlikheid (wat nie dieselfde is as die „apartheid” van die apartheidsideologie nie) geëerbiedig sal word.

Ons besef dat ons hiermee nie die laaste woord gespreek het nie, en gee ook nie voor dat ons dit kán doen nie. Tog is ons diep oortuig dat 'n beginsel van apartheid as geestelike grondslag vir die inrigting van die samelewing in die lig van die Skrif totaal verwerplik is, en dat ons ten minste 'n duidelike aanduiding gegee het van die rigting waarin ons meen die diskussie oor die enigste werklik Christelike benadering van ons landsvraagstuk gevoer moet word. In die apartheidsideologie het ons te doen met iets wat elke Christen in ons land ten diepste raak en waarmee niks minder op die spel is nie as ons aanspraak om Christelik te wees.

## VIA CRUCIS

### THE PUBLIC DIMENSION OF THE WAY OF THE CROSS FOR SOUTH AFRICAN CHRISTIANS

THE REV. H. HÄSELBARTH

**I hold that the Reformation gave to its Churches a new understanding of the cross as the all-important centre of the Christian's life and of Biblical theology.**

Martin Luther could say: “The cross alone is our theology” (*crux sola nostra theologia*), or: “To know Christ means to know the cross and thereby to perceive God in the crucified flesh” (*Christum nosse est crucem nosse et deum sub carne crucifixa intelligere*). Luther and the other Reformers believed that in this way God could be honoured as God, that his Lordship is maintained against man's inclination to deify himself. The anthropological consequence of such a concept is the recognition of man as a sinner, whereas its hermeneutical aim is the message of the justification of the sinner. For this sinner Christ had to die “outside the camp”, that is, outside the holy places of the righteous. He so became the bearer

of sin and the bringer of reconciliation to those, “who went forth to him outside the camp, bearing abuse for him” (Heb. 13:14). The righteous man, if he wants to meet Him, has to “become” a sinner and be crucified with his Saviour. There is no other way “to be in Christ”. All chapters in theology can only serve as explications of such a Theology of the Cross. One cannot, without betraying the basic insights of the Reformers, add the Theology of the Cross to other concepts of history and of man, as such a method will sooner or later end up in attempts to glorify man. The Theology of the Cross and the theology of glory exclude each other totally.

It is a fact that, at this point, the Churches of the Reformation have

seldom been faithful to their origin. The cross became a symbol instead of a way of life. It had its place in the private piety of faithful Christians, but not in the public arena. The Theology of the Cross and politics, for instance, were never really confronted with each other. That left the sphere of politics to the demons. This was the special Lutheran temptation. The tradition of Calvin tended to support theocratic states in which the Gospel had to strengthen the political aims of the people — *ad majorem gloriam Dei*. Too often it was the glory of man instead. The Theology of the Cross remained thus a stumbling-block on both sides, it was cherished as a doctrine and as a heritage, but Church organizations, congregational life and policy were shaped in a different manner. The cross remains an alien symbol, so

much that today the question arises, whether Protestant Churches, in the centre of their life, have not in fact become Roman Catholic (see the article of D. Bax in "Pro Veritate", Oct. 15, 1966: "Has the Dutch Reformed Church become Roman Catholic?" The same question can well arise with other Churches, for instance within the Lutheran Church of which I am a member). The point of decision in such a situation is, and will remain, the cross: *Crux probat omnia*.

### SUFFERING

In my view, the dilemma of the South African Churches at present lies in the irrelevance of their witness. This, I hold, is largely due to the unwillingness to preach the cross and to accept suffering as a natural consequence of such preaching. This is true with African and with European Christians. Background and traditions may differ on both sides of the colour-line, but before the cross of Christ Africans and Whites betray likeness and utter equality. It is the equality of sinners which makes the colour-bar superfluous and wrong. I want to show how Africans and Europeans reject the cross of Christ and it will become clear that in the end "African" and "European" are no longer sections of people on either side of the colour-bar, but simply types of man before God. Paul, likewise, in I Cor. 1 could speak of "Jews" and "Greeks" as types of men who rejected his proclamation of the cross. When you reject this cross, it does not matter very much to which side you belong after all.

African Church members in their rejection of the cross are to an extent guided by the world-view of traditional African religion that serves to escape suffering rather than to accept it. Religion has to assert power, it must strengthen life-force by establishing the contact with the world of spirits. It is the influence of an old "theology of epiphanies", in which God, through the medium of spiritual agents, works wonders to prove his reality. In such a man-centered religion God becomes an instrument for achieving peace, equilibrium of powers and happiness. From this point of view the Theology of the Cross is foolishness and defeat. The Crucified stands in the way of human and divine glory. I believe

that from a rejection of the crucified Christ, and consequently of man's state as a sinner, there stems a major spiritual weakness in African congregations.

When it comes to suffering, it only brings about a "worldly grief which produces death". There seldom is that acceptance of suffering as a "godly grief that produces a repentance that leads to salvation and brings no regret" (2 Cor. 7:10).

Here may lie the root of a certain resignation among our African brothers, a reluctance to accept the responsibility of the Church for the social and political welfare of her people, if this responsibility implies sacrifice and even suffering at the hands of the authorities: "What does it help to say what you think is right, to speak like a prophet and to condemn the evil in our country? It will only bring me into trouble and I do not want to lose my job and worse things to happen." Such voices can be heard especially among middle-class Christians. It will usually end like this: "We Africans will have to suffer if we speak up, Europeans will not be hit hard." True as this last remark may be at times, can it suffice as a permanent excuse? Does not such a fatalistic attitude condemn the Gospel to irrelevance? To restrict the Gospel to private morals minimizes the danger of conflict, but at what an expense! In such a situation the *via crucis* will demand, that God's Word be again allowed to exert its transforming and judging impact on all spheres of life. Here Paul's message in Romans 12:2 is profoundly meaningful: "Do not be conformed to this world, but be transformed by the renewal of your mind that you may prove what is the will of God, what is good and acceptable and perfect". Compassion for the situation of our African brothers must not deter us from encouraging them at this point. They, too, like all other Christians, have to exercise themselves in the Theology of the Cross, which is the touch-stone of how we are faithful to Christ.

The way of escape from the cross in European congregations is shaped by tradition and history also. What makes them refuse to go on the *via crucis* is the thoughtless or the deliberate conformity and the day-to-day compromises with the South African Way of Life, which they enjoy and deify as an eternal order of natural law. Nation, wealth, cul-

ture and history are worshipped; for to what your heart clings, this is your God. What meaning can be derived from the crucified Christ within the set of such man-made values?

### WARNING VOICES

Black and White South Africa are thus unanimous in the rejection of the *via crucis*. There have been warning voices though, which tried to prepare the Churches for the cross. They have repeatedly stated that the Policy of Separate Development is at variance with Scripture (see for instance the editorial of "Pro Veritate", May 15, 1967). The watch-men have shouted the alarm: The Christian faith is incompatible with the accepted policy of our country; however, the South African Churches have not yet begun in earnest to draw the consequences from such a recognized truth.

There have instead been various attempts among Christians to silence the watch-men and to discredit their motives, in order to delay the awakening that has to come. Another way has been to restrict the Gospel to the "spiritual" sphere and to deny its implications for the whole welfare of the society. A third escape-route is taken by those who believe that Christian and national values must be defended together. It is easily overlooked how such a symbiosis can become an ideology, which, in its marks, is similar to those enemies which it wants to ward off.

The alarm of the watch-men is still in our ears. How can we take heed of what they are crying? The answer for the Churches of the Reformation can only consist in a new apprehension of their own heritage and their very foundation: the Theology of the Cross, that foolishness in the eyes of both Africans and Europeans. Through it a discipleship of Christ must be taught, which prepares men and women to bear that amount of suffering that God assigns for South Africa. This is the way, out of irrelevance into meaningfulness. The *via crucis* is not passive acceptance of what the majority wants us to believe, nor does it mean a way of compromise and humble submissiveness which bows to the sympathies of the authorities. It rather means active alertness in Christian discipleship. This suggests that "cross" is not only a way of life in one's own

devotional sphere, but for the Christian it has public and civil dimensions. Thus the *via crucis* is always controversial, it is set against the experiences of the idealists and of the realists, it belongs to the Christians who are the "third generation". This emerges from the following three steps which belong to the *via crucis*:

(1) courageously to expose those aspects of our private and national life where God's will stands against our individual and our collective selfishness;

(2) to make this will of God known in fearlessly applying it to all aspects of our life for the sake of making God the Lord in them;

(3) willingly to accept the consequences of such proclamation, even if this might imply suffering and ostracism. This last step is needed most, in order to show that we love the country and its people and do not mean protest for protest's sake. Such suffering happens in passive resistance and in a defiant love for one's adversaries — see as an example the life of chief Albert J. Luthuli. In this way protest and surrender have their times in the life of those who are called as peacemakers in South Africa.

### TEMPTATION

In the years to come our faith has to be practised according to these three steps, although so far only few can claim experience. Christ our Master himself has to lead the way. He began his *via crucis* in the desert and ended it on the cross. It was then that the tempter came and made his proposition: "If thou art the Son of God, come down . . ."

The same voice wants to argue with the Church of the cross here in South Africa (see H. Thielicke, "Between God and Satan", Grand Rapids 1958, p. 33f); it spoke to the Confessing Church in Nazi-Germany and is heard everywhere where the Church of Christ has to speak against the powers of this age. This voice says:

Don't you see, little flock, that you do not belong to the evil-doers and enemies of the state among whom you are counted? Don't you see how your critics are blessed, don't you see their victories? Shouldn't your place be with those who are in power, who represent the beliefs of the majority of voters? To you belongs the place of honour in history, close to the monuments and memorials. Sit with the idolised and proclaim your allegiance to them, for God blesses them! Step

down from the cross, touch the stones and your hunger and need will be satisfied. Forget the hunger of the millions, leave the desert, live on the sunny side of life, for God is light! Live with the great ones, where the *vox populi* rings loud. Don't you hear that it is the *vox Dei*? One God and one country; your history and the nation's history are one. This is what you, the Church, belong to in South Africa. For from God there follows — glory, not a cross. From God follows — unity with the world, not revolt and judgment.

Therefore: You, Church of the Son of God, come down, come down!

Thus speaks the Tempter today. Those who have ears in the Dutch Reformed Churches and in the English-speaking Churches, as well as those in the African Churches are familiar with this voice. What will be their answer? Thanks to God there is another voice, the voice of the One who prevailed against the Tempter, and He says: "and he who does not take his cross and follow me is not worthy of me. He who finds his life will lose it, and he who loses his life for my sake will find it." I believe this is a word the South African Churches need to take to their heart more than any other word today.

## WIE MEEN DAT HY STAAN, MOET OPPAS DAT HY NIE VAL NIE

DR. C. J. LABUSCHAGNE

### VOLKSIDEAAL

Selfversekerdheid en vasberadenheid is eienskappe wat gewoonlik sonder meer as deugde gewaardeer word. So het een van ons ouer digters eens die loftrompet gesteek en hierdie twee menslike deugde uitbundig bejubel in 'n gediggie wat groot indruk op my gemaak het in my puberteitsjare:

Ek hou van 'n man wat sy man kan staan;  
ek hou van 'n arm wat 'n slag kan slaan;  
'n oog wat nie wyk,  
wat 'n bars kan kyk;  
en 'n wil wat so vas soos 'n klipsteen staan!

Voorwaar 'n MAN, die ideaal van 'n puber wat probeer MAN word! Dat hierdie beeld wat van 'n MAN voorgehou word, teologies beoordeel totaal misleidend is, het ek self in my jonger jare nie besef nie. Baie jare later eers namate ek meer begin verstaan het hoe Gods Woord dié soort man beoordeel, het hierdie versie my begin hinder. Dit sou my seker nie gehinder het nie as mens

dié gediggie kon beskou as net maar 'n uiting van 'n vervloë tyd waarin die digter sy hartgrondige hekel aan lamsakkerigheid te kenne wou gee. As polemië teen 'Lamsak ou maat, ons is burgers van pappbroekland' sou mens dit nog kon waardeer. Maar dit is meer as dit! Dit is 'n positiewe, onvoorwaardelike aanprysing van selfversekerdheid en vasberadenheid.

Wat is hiermee verkeerd? sou u kon vra. Daar kom ons netnou by. Eers wil ek opmerk dat die gees wat uit hierdie gediggie spreek 'n groter rol speel as wat ons geneig is om toe te gee, want hierdie gees het hom meester gemaak van die siel van my volk — en waar hierdie gees huis, vlug die deemoed en barmhartigheid terwyl enige besef van skuld en dwaling en menslike feilbaarheid as swakheid afgekraak word.

Hierdie MAN van wyle Jan Celliers word al meer en meer voorgehou as die ideaal. En dit is nie net onverantwoordelike pubers wat hierdeur beïndruk word nie! Hierdie MAN is die afgelope jare tot volksideaal verhef; trouens dié ideaal



skyn nou verwesenlik te wees: Ons bevind ons op die hoë kruine van selfversekerdheid en ons het daar gekom omdat ons ons man kon staan. Ons arm het getoon dat hy 'n slag kan slaan, en pasop hy sal nog harder slaan! Ons oog het getoon dat hy nie wyk nie, wees gewaarsku hierdie oog van ons kan 'n bars kyk! Ons wil het getoon dat hy vas soos 'n klipsteen staan, gee pad of word verbrysel! Opposisie duld ons nie; kritiek verdra ons nie; raad het ons nie nodig nie; na jere-mias luister ons nie; vir proteste en petisies is ons nou moeg; die sieklike sentimentele geklets gaan ons nie langer duld nie; ons is siek en sat van al die leuens; ons is vasberade . . . (die res word oordonder deur 'n magtige 'Hoor-Hoor' dreuning).

### DIE „LASTIGE” WOORD

Kom, Christenvolk, kom julle wat teen rooidagmôre „Op U Almag vas vertrouend” instemmend aanhoor, kom ons luister nou vir 'n keer wat Gods Woord oor selfversekerdheid sê. Kom ons lees I Korinthiërs 10:12. Nee, moenie julle ore toedruk nie! O, julle luister nie na 'n „liberalis” nie? Toemaar, ek verwag dit ook nie! Buitendien, ek is maar net 'n gewone Afrikaner wat ernstig daarna streef om God te gehoorsaam en sy Woord ter harte te neem. Om die waarheid te sê, ek het nie die minste begeerte dat julle na my moet luister nie, maar kom tog maar dan luister ons saam na Gods Woord. Wat lees ons daar in I Kor. 10:12? „Daarom, wie meen dat hy staan moet oppas dat hy nie val nie”. Lastige teks, nie waar nie? Onheilspellend, gee u toe? O, sê u dominee dat u dit nie só letterlik moet opneem nie? Ekskuus, sê hy dat dit beteken dat ons nou moet laertrek en nog strenger maatreëls moet neem om ons voortbestaan te verseker? En wek hy ons op om ons man te staan met stale vuis, doelgerig en vasberade nie na links of regs te kyk nie en 'n wil te hê van klipsteen? En troos hy u deur u gou te verwys na Romeine 8: „As God vir ons is, wie kan teen ons wees?” . . . ? Wat sê u, voel u tog nie getroos en gelukkig nie? Ek ook nie. Kom ons lees nog 'n paar gedeeltes uit die Woord. Gebruik gerus maar daardie arm wat 'n slag kan slaan ook 'n keer om die bladsye van die Bybel mee om te blaai — ons blaai na Lukas 22. 'n Lang hoofstuk? Toemaar, daardie oog wat in staat is om 'n bars te kyk kan maklik

hierdie een-en-sewentig versies lees! Maar ons lees maar net enkele gedeeltes uit dié hoofstuk. Moet tog nie dink dat ek u wil doodgooi met Bybeltekste nie, soos die dominee die ander dag gesê het. Kom ons lees verse 31 tot 34 en dan weer 54 tot 62. Wil u nog 'n gedeelte bylees? Wil u? Goed, as 'n mens 'n wil het wat so vas soos 'n klipsteen staan, dan kan mens seker die wil aan die dag lê om nog I Samuel 15:16-25 daarby te lees.

### PETRUS

Wat laat die Woord van die Here ons sien? 'n MAN, 'n ROÏS, 'n Petrus, een van die eerste geroepe dissipels, die man wat soos 'n kolos altyd vooraan in die ry van dissipels staan, wie se naam altyd eerste verskyn in die dissipel-lyste van die Evangelies, die segsman van die twaalf, die man van durf en daad, wars van weifeling en aarseling, seker van homself, seker van sy geloof in sy Meester, seker van sy liefde en lojaliteit, toegewyd, vasberade om die Heer deur dik en dun by te staan — 'n man wat daarop aanspraak kon maak dat hy staan. En hierdie man, juis hierdie man, so laat die Evangelie ons sien, het geval, geval van die hoë kruin van selfversekerdheid in die diepe afgrond van verloëning. Die skrik slaan ons om die hart — hoe is dit moontlik? Gods Woord gee ons die antwoord: „Wie meen dat hy staan moet oppas dat hy nie val nie”!! In staat om te val is juis hy wat meen dat hy staan, kapabel om te verloën is juis hy wat belydenis gedoen het, ryp vir 'n tweede val is juis hy wat meen dat hy die eerste val te bowe gekom het.

Vir die verloëning van Petrus is verskillende verklarings gebied: Hy sou in daardie kritieke oomblikke na die gevangene van Jesus ter wille van sy eie veiligheid en selfbehoud (tipies menslik!) besluit het dat dit verstandig sou wees om liever niks te doen te wil hê met 'n Rabbi wat op die punt gestaan het om op grond van ernstige aanklagte veroordeel te word nie; of hy sou nie werklik bedoel het om sy Meester te verloën nie, maar sou drie wit leuens vertel het om so naby moontlik aan Jesus te bly. Beide verklarings veronderstel dat die verloëning 'n saak van die ongelukkige sameloop van omstandighede was. Die Evangelies loënstraf egter beide verklarings, want wie die gange van Petrus in die hele Evangelieverhaal volg, kom tot die ontdekking dat die

redes agter die verloëning veel verder teruggesoeek moet word as net die omstandighede van die nag waarin die verloëning plaasgevind het. Die wortels van hierdie afskuwelike daad lê veel dieper en verder terug in die geskiedenis van Petrus. Stap vir stap laat die Evangelie ons sien hoe hierdie vasberade, selfversekerde man telkens sy man probeer staan het óók teenoor Jesus, hoe hy herhaaldelik, seker van homself, sy eie woord en mening teenoor dié van die Meester gestel het. En dit was in die grond van die saak die dieperliggende rede vir sy verloëning. Wie dit beter wil weet as die Here, is gedoem om te val; wie so seker van homself is dat hy selfs durf om op grond van sy onwankelbare geloof in homself die waarskuwende woorde van die Here van hom te laat afrol, so iemand móét val. Dit het met die MAN Petrus gebeur, en dit sal en moet noodwendig ook gebeur met elkeen wat meen te beantwoord aan die beeld van die ideale MAN van Celliers se gediggie.

### ONS GESKIEDENIS

Hier is die geskiedenis van die Evangelie se man wat sy man probeer staan het, die man „met 'n wil wat so vas soos 'n klipsteen staan”, en dit is nie net sy geskiedenis nie, maar ook die geskiedenis van elkeen wat meen dat hy staan; hoor, selfversekerde volk, hier is ook óns geskiedenis:

1. Toe Jesus met sy dissipels op pad was na die stede in die Noorde van die land en Hy hulle begin leer het dat Hy baie sou ly, vervolg en verwerp sou word deur ouderling, owerpriester en volk, en uiteindelik gedood sou word, het Petrus Hom eenkant geneem en Hom streng tereggewys: „Mag God dit verhoed, Here, dit sal U nooit oorkom nie!” Teenoor die Woord van die Here stel hy sy eie woord: Here, U sê nou wel só, maar ek dink daar anders oor!

2. Toe Jesus tydens die laaste maaltyd die voete van al sy dissipels begin was het, het Petrus bewig geprotesteer: „U sal my voete in der ewigheid nie was nie!” Teenoor die woord en wil van die Here stel hy sy eie opinie. Here, U wil dit nou wel, maar ek sê: Nooit!

3. Toe hulle na die lofsang op pad was na die Olyfberg, sê Jesus vir sy dissipels: „Julle sal almal in hierdie nag aanstoot aan My neem”, en weer het Petrus dit beter geweet, want sy antwoord was „Al sal almal ook aanstoot aan U neem, ek sal

nooit aanstoot neem nie!" In volle selfversekerdheid meen hy dat hy die Meester kan opponeer; kyk, 'n man wat sy man kan staan!

4. Toe Jesus 'n persoonlike waarskuwing aan hom gee dat die Satan vurig begeer het om hulle soos koring te sif, maar dat Hy vir hom gebid het dat sy geloof nie ophou nie, het Petrus, die vasberade kolos, na vore getree met die versekering: „Here, ek is gereed om saam met U selfs in die gevangenis en in die dood te gaan!" Teenoor die Woord van die Here het hierdie selfversekerde mens weereens 'n wederwoord.

5. Direk hierna het Jesus hom ge-waarsku dat die haan nie sal kraai voordat hy drie maal geloën het dat hy Hom ken nie. Volgens Lukas het Petrus nie eens daarop geantwoord nie, maar Matthéüs verhaal dat hy die waarskuwing ten spyt tog 'n wederwoord gehad het: „Al moes ek ook saam met U sterwe, ek sal U nooit verloën nie!" Val dit u ook nou op hoe dikwels Petrus die woordjie „nooit" gebruik? Wat 'n vasberade man, 'n man met 'n wil wat so vas . . .

6. By die gevangening kry ons MAN die laaste geleentheid om te toon dat hy iemand is wat sy man kan staan. Welbewus van die feit dat Jesus baie duidelik verklaar het dat Hy gearrester, veroordeel en gedood sou word, het Petrus tog, toe die bende van die hoëpriester daar aankom, sy swaard getrek en begin kap. As Jesus Hom nie durf verset nie en as die ander dadeloos toekyk, nie hy nie, hy is 'n man van durf en daad, hy sal nog nooit toelaat dat hulle die Meester ongestraf kom arrester nie! „Ek hou van 'n

man wat sy man kan staan, ek hou van 'n arm wat 'n slag kan slaan . . ."

### GAL

Elke woord van hierdie versie van Celliers word 'n druppel gal in ons mond as ons bedink dat hierdie MAN oomblikke later hoog en laag sweer dat hy niks te doen het met daardie Jesus nie. Die pad van die vasberade, selfversekerde man loop uit in die afgrond van verloëning. „Wie meen dat hy staan moet oppas dat hy nie val nie!" Arme Petrus, het hy dan nie opgepas nie? Het hy dan nie sy lewe aan sy Meester toegewy nie? Het hy dan nie keer op keer sy lojaliteit en liefde vir die Heer bely nie? Was daar 'n toegewyde, lojalere, vasberadener dissipel as Petrus? Dit alles het hom niks gebaat nie, want die belangrikste het hy toe nog nie geleer nie — onvoorwaardelike gehoorsaamheid aan die Woord van die Here. Eers na die verloëning het hy dit besef; toe Jesus hom aangekyk het, so lees ons in Luk. 22:61, het hy „die woord van die Here onthou wat Hy vir hom gesê het". Al die ander kere het Petrus die woord van die Here van hom laat afrol soos water van 'n eend se rug — dáárom het hy geval, dáárom moes hy val. Niks is fundamenteel-belangriker as **gehoorsaamheid** nie, onvoorwaardelike gehoorsaamheid aan die woord van die Here. Dit is hierdie selfde beginsel wat die profeet Samuel koning Saul moes bybring: „Gehoorsaamheid is beter as slagoffer, om te luister beter as die vet van ramme."

Hoe het die held nie geval nie! Die MAN van so straks gaan na buite en ween bitterlik soos 'n kind.

Daardie trane van 'n gevalle selfversekerde is voor die aangesig van die Here soos kosbare pèrels, veel waardevoller as al daardie manhaftigheid; Hy hou van 'n man wat kan trane stort . . .

Skrik u nie nou van al die manhaftigheid in u en om u nie? Vind u nie nou, soos ek, al die selfversekerdheid en grootdoenerige vasberadenheid onheilspellend nie? Vind u nie nou die steek van die lof-trompet op die klipsteen-wil in ons hart uiters bedenklik en gevaarlik nie? Maak die geskiedenis van Petrus ons nie bang nie en veront-rus sy verloëning ons nie? Wat hoor ek daar? Ek het dit al meer gehoor: Ons laat ons nie bangmaak nie; ons word nie beïndruk deur sentimentele praatjies wat daarop bereken is om die volk sag te maak en ryp vir die Kommunisme nie; moenie by ons 'n skuldgevoel opwek nie, want dit is presies wat die kommuniste wil hê. Goed, my broers, die Here is my getuie, wees dan gewaarsku — hierdie pad van grenselose selfversekerdheid wat u met soveel vasberadenheid loop, is die sekere pad na Christusverloëning en ondergang. Wees gewaarsku, hierdie pad wat so aangeprys word met behulp van talle propagandamiddele en waar die eis van gehoorsaamheid aan Gods Woord agtergestel word by die eise van die tyd, hierdie pad voer na die afgrond. Hierdie pad van sogenaamde doelgerigtheid loop gevaarlik steil in Gods oog — na die kruin wag 'n afgrond. Hoelank wil 'n volk dit beter weet as die Here? Wees gewaarsku, nie deur my nie, maar deur die Here self: Wie meen dat hy staan moet oppas dat hy nie val nie!

## Apartheid 'n Saak van „Geloofsoortuiging"

Die stelling dat apartheid 'n geloofsbelydenis, 'n religie is, en dat ons daarin nie maar bloot met 'n praktiese beleid te doen het nie maar met 'n pseudo-Christelike heilsleer, word soms heftig ontken. Daar is selfs teoloë in ons land wat erg aanstoot neem as daar van die „apartheidsideologie" gepraat word.

Hoe die saak in werklikheid staan, blyk uit 'n berig in *Die Burger* (5.9.1967) waarin vertel word dat mnr. M. C. Botha, Minister van Bantoe-Administrasie en Ontwikkeling en Bantoe-onderwys, onlangs by geleentheid van 'n kongres van die

Nasionale Jeugbond in die Vrystaat verklaar het dat die apartheidsbeleid vir die Regering 'n saak van geloofsoortuiging is. Die beleid van afsonderlike ontwikkeling is geen proef-neming nie, aldus die Minister, volgens die berig. Daar is geen alternatiewe planne in die Nasionale Party se politieke koelkas gebêre nie. Die beleid van afsonderlike ontwikkeling word uit geloofsoortuiging deur die Regering toegepas volgens die natuurlike toestand in Suid-Afrika. „Ons moet ons mensmassa erken en aanvaar as verskillende entiteite, soos God dit bedoel het". Die Minister het

ook daarop gewys dat die besef van afsonderlike volke nog nie duidelik genoeg in die volksbewussyn uitgekristalliseer het nie, en gesê dat *die begrip van afsonderlike volke tot sy uiterste konsekwensie deurgevoer moet word*. (Ons kursivering). „Die Bantoes", so word die woorde van die Minister aangehaal, „kan nie end-nit behandel word asof hulle lede van ons volk is nie. Hulle behoort tot ander volke". En: „Oor die Indiërs en die Kleurlinge se regte veelvolkige ontwikkeling moet nog diep gedink word. Dit is egter nie iets waaroor ek kan praat nie".

# FROM BREAKWATER TO OPEN SEA

DR. CALVIN COOK

The University Christian Movement was inaugurated at a service in the dining hall of the Grahamstown Training College on Friday, 14th July, 1967. No one commented on the significance of the date. No ecclesiastical Bastille fell; there was no cheering from under-graduate sansculottes. The service of inauguration was both ancient and modern. We sat round two tables, on one of which was set a torch lit during the service, and on the other, an empty cup and paten. We used for our worship psalms, prayers from all eras and traditions of the church, and then before the end of the service, at the moment when in a eucharist, mass or communion, bread would have been broken and wine poured out, we paused. We adjourned to side tables to eat hot-dogs and drink coffee. Thus we took our divisions seriously, but equally, to affirm the fellowship which had been created, we concluded with the Lord's prayer, and blessed one another by name and with a handshake. (Has the hot-dog become the new ecumenical symbol? Emigrant Frankfurter indigenized by American pragmatism, and garnished according to taste with French or English mustard or Asiatic gherkin.)

Did such a service parody sacred traditions? Yes and no: in the same way that properly authorized sacraments parody them. The empty cup and paten were as defective for us as the full cup and paten must be as long as we are divided from one another. The service expressed both a sense of continuity in that the God of prophets and apostles was with us in this, and we believed had called us to this work; of discontinuity, because we were a bit self-conscious about it all as we recognized that while God's purpose had not changed, and indeed because it had not changed, we had been driven to new means and expressions of our task. The final parody would have been to continue as before: this would not only have been parody, but perversion.

The conference report sets out the main decisions of the conference, the findings of the various work groups, the four addresses, and the bible study programme. It also contains a good deal of the spirit of the gathering. Thus it is a document which is not merely indispensable to historians, but will illuminate not only the delegates, but also all interested in this work. We owe a great deal to the editors who assembled the report after the conference had ended.

## BACKGROUND

The background of this conference needs to be understood against our university and church history, of which the fortunes of the S.C.A.

may be taken as a barometer. Because the S.C.A. faithfully reflected the spiritual and institutional trends in this country, it reflected also the gradual dissolution of the protestant consensus which our spiritual history has assumed till now. Increasingly, its evangelism tended to reflect the modes and moods of a particular party; its ecumenism became increasingly, that of like-minded individuals who happened to be members of different churches working together rather than the wrestling of different churches with one another on common tasks. Perhaps most important of all, the imperatives of discipleship were never faced as patiently or as thoroughly as they should have been. Members were allowed to think that discipleship could involve evangelism or social concern according to taste or temperament. Disparate elements of the S.C.A. could work happily as long as they were isolated from one another, but as contact increased, so did friction. Members wondered at times whether the various species of the genus had anything in common with each other. The sharpest conflicts occurred where contact was closest and most sustained: in inter-varsity conferences. The clashes occasioned by these conferences could not be ignored, least of all by those who did not attend and therefore who feared the implications of such contacts. For in these conferences, inevitably questions involving the nature of the gospel, the means used in its proclamation, social involvement, ecumenical relationships

were all raised and discussed with a frankness sufficient to cause trouble both within denominations and between them. We began to realize how little we understood of the presuppositions or of the processes of reconciliation. At the same time, the improbable happened in the shape of Vatican II, necessitating the revision of the whole field of inter-church relationships. If the dissolution of the old S.C.A. reflected the end of the protestant consensus, the founding of the U.C.M. was in part occasioned by the new openness of Rome.

When therefore the S.C.A. decided in January, 1965 to split into four separate movements, the future development of the three smaller groups was far from clear. If racial separation was seen as a necessity for the development of the C.S.V. (the Afrikaans section) it was largely irrelevant for the other three. For in contrast with the church constituency of the C.S.V., that of the S.C.A., the S.C.M., and the C.S.B. was multi-racial. A division on racial grounds was thus largely meaningless.

On the other hand, within the S.C.A., a group felt that the theological position of the S.C.A. was too indistinct, and that "for the sake of clarity" it should adopt a basis of faith. The church constituency of the S.C.A. was not consulted in this regard, nor indeed could it have been assumed to be favourable, since most of the churches represented on the advisory council of the S.C.A. remained both members of and in sympathy with the World Council of Churches. Hence within the S.C.A. two distinct opinions emerged, one believing that under the present circumstances, the maintenance of the multi-racial and open character of the church was the primary article of faith, and the other believing that this was less important than a declaration that the S.C.A. stood in the tradition of the evangelical party. The rest of Christendom has not been able to dispense with a plurality of ecumenical organizations. Now South Africa has followed this general pattern. The gulf between Christians

and churches apparently defies the capacities of present day bridge-builders to connect with a single span. For the moment, like the San Francisco Bay Bridge, we appear to need two spans to cover the distance.

Once the S.C.A. had taken the decision to adopt a basis of faith, many in the churches that had hitherto supported the S.C.A. felt impelled to seek another movement that would be a vehicle for joint ecumenical and evangelical action. As a result of various university missions, some formal or informal groupings already existed. In these, the S.C.A. had come to be represented as a kind of "other ranks" denominational society for those not fortunate enough to be Anglicans, Romans or Methodists. To the extent that the S.C.A. had adopted a particular line or ethos, it could no longer function as a co-ordinator of various denominational societies and became instead like one of them.

The Archbishop of Cape Town convened a meeting of representatives of the Church of the Province, the Roman Catholic, the Congregational, the Methodist and the Presbyterian churches in Cape Town in November, 1966. The purpose of the conference was to review the situation and to discuss the advisability of another student movement. The conference resolved to make such a start. A fortnight later, a second conference, composed of chaplains and student society leaders decided similarly, and appointed Mr. R. Steven full-time agent to organize the inaugural conference of the U.C.M.

### TASK

The U.C.M. has accepted an enormous task. This is defined by the assumptions the U.C.M. is making. U.C.M. assumes there is a community of interest between staff and students within the university and seeks to foster this. It assumes, despite denominational differences, that Christian unity can be manifested and developed. It assumes, despite segregated institutions, that Christians in the academic world have common interests and pursuits. Finally, despite racial, social, cultural and national differences, it assumes the possibility of

Christian fellowship and aims to realize this possibility in the present circumstances of our country, and to the extent of including representatives from the University College of Botswana, Lesotho and Swaziland.

Further, it believes that it is not the time nor the function of the movement to try to distinguish between wheat and tares. Nor has it any idea of whether a church can be founded on Mars Hill, but is convinced that the effort has to be made, and suspects that if a church is founded, it will differ in many respects from the church in the Corinthian suburbs. As to methods, it is both uncertain and eclectic: the Spirit is not obliged to bless any method, and may reject those that seem to us to be the most appropriate or reasonable in favour of the unlikely. Apologetics may well be theoretically impossible, but they remain practically necessary because some philosophers and academics have heard rumours that Christians are concerned with matters such as truth and unity that are essential to the life of the university. Yet we would not be realistic if we did not also recognize that their expectations are low: somewhere between an interesting but unproven theory and outright poppycock. (How else would you translate 'spermalogos'?)

### STRUCTURE AND ETHOS

The structure and ethos of the U.C.M. accepts an inherent tension at each of a number of points. It is therefore impossible to predict which way the movement will develop, except that it is aware of the need to preserve these tensions within itself to define its life and purpose.

1. The U.C.M. is clearly student led, and at the same time church representatives participate directly. Such an arrangement creates tension between church and university, yet at the same time makes possible responsible action towards both.

2. The character of the U.C.M. is both that of an "umbrella" enabling denominational societies to meet and co-ordinate their activities, as well as an organization to which one may belong directly and individually, and hence with initiatives of its own. Here too, its character will have to be defined: whether it will become primarily an

immobile ecclesiastical U.N.O., or like U.N.E.S.C.O. develop its own "dangerous" initiatives as well. There are dangers both ways. If U.C.M. decides to play safe ecclesiastically, it may well make itself insignificant for the university. On the other hand, if it blasts off on an exclusively university orbit, it will suffer by being cut off from the rest of Christendom. If it is only an umbrella, it will only duplicate committee work and waste time that could be much better employed. University evangelism, for instance, requires united action: on the other hand, it must also manifest the decisiveness of the sword of the Spirit, the edge of which is often blunted by inter-committee shuffling.

3. Our theological imperatives still have to be thought out. We have assumed too easily that evangelism and social action, university work or parish involvement were options to be chosen according to temperament. There is perhaps no more urgent task for the church as a whole and particularly its university segment than to do this thinking. Were such study to be done faithfully, we might well find that what we have urged as either/ors turn out to be matters about which our Lord is saying "These you should have done and not left the others undone."

4. What about our associations with those who differ from us? The isolation of university faculties from one another is not as complete as that between churches; consequently, the absurdity of co-existence without speaking to one another is more apparent in the university than in the church. We can of course easily cite in justification of such practices, that separation is the root of holiness. But since Bethlehem, holiness has been incarnate as well. We must presume that Christ is still at work among those whom we may regard as socially, politically or religiously undesirable. Indeed, these may even be ahead of us in the queue for the Kingdom of God. Obviously, without distinctiveness, the salt loses its savour; but unless we are in real contact with others, we will not make disciples. Hence, both on the campus and beyond, the church must recognize that such contact and dialogue is the prerequisite of the gospel. Such contact may be as important for the church as for the university: in our own time, it is quite possible that the

university may again be used of God to teach a doubting and disobedient church some home truths.

5. How can such a distinctive identity and tang be preserved along with contact? The U.C.M. recognizes one way only: faithful discipleship, personal commitment to Christ, to what he is doing at the moment, and the means he is using. It has rejected a creedal statement of identity as unhelpful. To the extent that such discipleship is true, it will have degrees of apparent unintelligibility, unconventionality, irrationality or inexplicability, for these are ways in which true faith has always been distinguished from social conventions. The consistency of the disciple is to be sought in the faithfulness of his following alone. Disciples must take risks; they will sometimes be wrong. The disciple, because he has both to walk in the light and in fellowship will constantly need the cleansing of Christ. Forgiveness is both a possibility and a prerequisite. The test for the U.C.M. will be whether it uses the freedom it claims from creedal formulations in ways that make its discipleship plain. It must strive continuously to align its actions with the character of the one it claims to serve.

6. The U.C.M. is concerned not only with the individual, but also with the corporate aspect of ecumenical relations. It accepts the individual for and as his church accepts him. This leads to obvious

ambiguities. Again, given the inertia of groups, the U.C.M. may have seriously handicapped itself by working through denominational entities and structures, as well as by introducing into university work that which may well prove to be essentially irrelevant. Denominational considerations may indeed prove to be the weights we may have to lay aside if we are to run the university race as we ought. But at this moment, U.C.M. recognizes the need for such a method of working. It holds simultaneously to the exhortation of "Let the church be the church" and "Let the university be the university" in the belief that despite appearances, these two may not be contradictory. Yet a church unconcerned with being the church, or a university unconcerned with being the university may well be in conflict with each other. In order to explore the implications of this realistically, the U.C.M. has established five regional groups to further its fellowship and work.

#### FUTURE

Time alone will tell whether the U.C.M. was born more of prophecy than of neurosis; whether it was merely a symptom of its time, a sick reaction to sick events, or whether it was also an instrument of the eternal God. Time will also show whether it was really necessary. Certainly its advent raises the

question of "Why multiple student organizations?" and behind that the question "Which is right?" Multiplicity complicates both existence and choice.

As with all else in human life, the best hope of the U.C.M. lies in its being equivocal: that men should not be able to dismiss it as merely of men. As long as there was only one student organization, the question of "rightness" was scarcely raised except by those who for one reason or another were excluded or felt themselves excluded. Perhaps it was then too easy for us in the S.C.A. to assume that God's will was being done. Now, and as long as two movements exist, neither will be able to claim that it constitutes the only means of witness or salvation.

Yet the question "Why two?" must never be answered complacently. For as long as there is a question about our unity, there will also be questions about our holiness and our mission. Nevertheless, these events leading to division and to the creation of duplicate organizations, which we were powerless to prevent may yet under God be a means to help us to understand not only our powerlessness and presumption, but also the power and humility of his gospel of reconciliation. Perhaps it is in order to teach us to fish more effectively that he has thrown us off our breakwaters into his open sea.

## THE VERKRAMPTE

DAVID PERK

**Whether or not they are politically motivated, verkrampes are always with us and have always been. And this is true of all communities, at all times. However distinguished or undistinguished, they represent the unyielding, unadapting elements in a community.**

There is an inertia in all of us that the challenge of an evolving life has to overcome, and there are times when we all, individually, positively resist change.

The verkrampes differ from this pattern in that their resistance is more extreme, sustained and vociferous. They seek to make a virtue of what is really a defect in the adaptive structure of the human being. Most of us, sooner or later, yield to the weight and ultimate reason of facts and events, and look

back ashamedly on the resistance to them that we put up for a period. It is the opposite with the verkrampes. The impact of gathering facts and events only provokes their mounting opposition and bitterness, until it begins to look unseemly and meaningless. Or else they retreat unabashed, for temporary respite, to the brooding silence of their unflinching hostility to change. They make no concession to changing times, moods and modes.

If, in their forays, they would

stop short of besmirching personalities and respect the right of others to hold different views, they would arouse no more attention than the acknowledgement that verkrampes are always with us. But they are more sensitive and protective to their personalities and rights than to those of others, who are therefore forced, from time to time, to make a stand, in self-defence. There is nothing phenomenal in the struggle with the verkrampes. It is an inevitable expression of man's struggle to adjust to reality. The struggle is as shortlived as recurrent. Men are born and die, and their unrealistic ideas with them. Humanity carries on, advancing on a front

and with a force too broad and powerful to comprehend and resist.

In the short term, the activities of the *verkramptes*, individually and collectively, make a sad spectacle; and that, for a number of reasons. They are pettifogging against the background of the tremendous political and moral issues in which we are enmeshed, and they dissipate talents and energies that could be better used in the cause of South Africa's progress.

Like children on a beach, they spend themselves constructing castles of sand and surrounding them with ramparts of sand, unheeding of the tide that must sooner or later obliterate them.

### LACK OF FAITH

The *verkramptes* seek to encase time-honoured attitudes in archaic protocols because they have not the faith to turn to every fresh day with the conviction that it will guide and support them to meet the challenges of the day. They turn their backs to the light and only see shadows ahead of them, not recognising they arise from their stance.

**Nothing would be more unfortunate for South Africa's image abroad than that the world overseas should see South Africa's problem crystallized in the struggle of the *verligtes* with the *verkramptes*.** There are, in all communities, a section that is intolerant of change because, basically, it has not the faith to meet changing conditions with the supple strength of its spiritual resources. Man, in his progress, must of necessity create change. It reflects his progressive evolution and its impact on his living conditions and history. This process is there for all to see, but some, for lack of faith, cling to the present they have adapted to and refuse to be launched by the tide that offers to take them on the journey to the unexplored mystery of life and progress.

The basic principles of individual and social life, such as are written into the codes of all civilized communities, are universal and more or less uniform. They have grown out of experience under different conditions. They influence the conditions, but they also grow out of and with changing conditions. A hindview of history demonstrates that change inheres in evolving life, which is reflected in our ethical and social

principles no less than in our comprehensions and operations.

When a body of people seeks to encase a community, as they have encased themselves, in an outlook and way of life that held good for a generation and period that has passed they are compelled to invoke the cause of precious tradition to gain support for their philosophy. But their inflexibility is as false to life as their concept of tradition is. Tradition must grow with life, and life is ever evolving new forms. If the evolution of ideas is not impeded or hampered by threat and violence it proceeds organically, old forms becoming incorporated and sanctified by new ones.

It would be an unhappy day for South Africa and for our reputation abroad if the *verkramptes* constituted more than an off-centre body, exerting little if any influence in directing our social and political evolution. The fact is that even in the traditional stronghold of conservatism, viz., the Church, there is a ferment of review and reorientation regarding our social values and habits and the relationships of the various sections of our community. What the ultimate outcome will be cannot be clearly foreseen and forecast, but it is important that the challenge of changing conditions has been accepted by a growing sector of the Church.

Our political leaders, in their response to the challenge that comes from the increasing number of non-whites who seek educational and social advancement and the benefits of our expanding economy, on the one hand, and our multiplying industries that attract an increasing number of non-whites into their maw, on the other, are displaying a flexibility in their handling of the problems that keep testing and challenging apartheid that promises progressive adaptation to the realities of the situation. The clamour of the *verkramptes* will not avail to still the voice of sense and reasonableness that begins to echo through the South African scene.

### TIME AGAINST US

The most formidable enemy that South Africa has to face is time. With the speed of modern communications, news and information is almost instantly circulated round the world. Few have the time, suspi-

cion, inclination or facilities to check their veracity, with the result that the masses are wide open to the slanted propaganda that is conveyed according to the type and formulation of the news. The under-privileged, wherever they may be, are understandably susceptible to the propaganda that promises them self-advancement and fulfilment, so that they become puppets in the hands of the propagandists. In South Africa we have a large section of the community that is currently under-privileged politically, economically, educationally and socially. If daily experiences do not continually remind them of their position and status, they are certainly not allowed to forget them, one way and another, by the world press and other media of international communication.

**In time we would work out our salvation. The ferment of thought and feeling manifest in our politics, press and literature is evidence that we are working towards it. But shall we be given the time?**

No-one is in a position to say what time we have available to reduce the sources of friction and discontent in our midst to the point where the majority of the white and non-white population can wholeheartedly support the *modus vivendi* evolved in the process. But certain it is that we cannot afford the luxury of a protracted and leisurely approach to our problems. South Africa is in no position to hurry any solution, but neither has it time on its side.

### PATRIOTISM

We have to decide how we are to act in the not unlimited time ahead of us to achieve a people united in a common loyalty to a South Africa, which cares for, protects and represents them all. As long as government policy and public opinion focusses on the cultural differences between sections of the community, as reflected in apartheid and separate development, rather than on their common needs, there will be more than one image of South Africa to which they are asked to adhere. This opposes a common allegiance and patriotism.

It is instinct in man to preserve his group, but a policy aimed at preserving the different ethnic groups should ensure at the same

time that they remain an integral part of a united South Africa, for the sake of peace and progress.

**Because of current policy and mood, it has become almost a sport to bait anyone who does not support apartheid to the extreme as a 'liberal', implying a lack of patriotism. This attitude is not only grievously unjust to such people, but it spells by inference the baiter's arrogant claim to omniscience and infallibility. There cannot be too many minds giving thought and voice to our problems. Patriotism does not reside in any one policy,**

**nor is it reflected in the view of any one section, whether large or small, influential or not.**

*Only with open-mindedness and humility, so that views and the people who express them are respected, will there be dialogue, understanding and eventual agreement. Without these, each section occupies its own camp and regards the occupants of other camps with suspicion and hostility. If there were desire for communication there would be less fear of opposition.*

The South African scene is changing, however slowly. The pro-

test of the verkrampes will not stay the course of history. When the Afrikaans community was seeking to entrench its individuality, language and culture against formidable odds it could not but stand guard at its sectional boundaries. Some, in their zeal, equated the sectional goals with South Africanism. But their self-establishment has given them the confidence and strength to recognise the larger South Africa and the values that all sections can contribute to it. This is the challenge that the verkrampes cannot face up to.

## DIE KERK BUIITE SUID-AFRIKA

PROF. B. B. KEET

### MIDDE-OOSTE

**Dit is interessant om die reaksie van verskillende kerkgroepe tot die situasie in die Midde-Ooste waar te neem. Vir die volgende indrukke en verklarings is ons dank verskuldig aan Ecumenical Press Service (E.P.S.) wat in Junie verskyn het.**

Eers word die verklaring van die Wêreldraad van Kerke deur middel van sy algemene sekretaris, Eugene Carson Blake, heel versigtig gestel. Uit Genève rapporteer hy:

Dringende versoeke het die Wêreldraad van Kerke bereik om in die konflik tussen Arabiere en Israëliete kant te kies. Die Wêreldraad wils egter dat sy eerste verantwoordelikheid is om 'n bewerker van versoening te wees tussen kulturele, ideologiese en nasionale verdeelings. Daarom kan hy hom nie vereenselwig met die politieke oogmerke van enige staat nie. Dr. Blake se verklaring is gestel in 'n brief aan die 223 lid-kerke en aan die Sentrale en Uitvoerende Komitees, met 'n uiteensetting van wat die sekretariaat gedoen het en nog voornemens was om te doen met die leidende beginsels wat hom beweeg het tot sy optrede.

Twee staflede is na Jerusalem gestuur en een na Beirut, Damaskus en Kairo, om rugspraak te hou met kerke, verteenwoordigers van internasionale agentskappe en regeringsamptenare. Hulle moet uitvind wat die Wêreldraad kan doen om uitgewekenes te help, Arabiere sowel as Israëliete, 'n oplossing te vind vir

die probleem van uitgewekenes, ander hindernisse in die weg van 'n regverdige vrede te verwyder en 'n billike oplossing vir die probleem van die heilige plekke in Jerusalem te probeer vind. Op 9 Junie het die Wêreldraad 'n beroep gemaak op die lid-kerke om twee miljoen dollar bymekaar te maak ten einde slagoffers van die oorlog in die Midde-Ooste te hulp te kom. (Bydraes is reeds gestuur deur die Rooms-Katolieke organisasie, Caritas Internasionalis; en deur verskeie Nederlandse liggames soos die Remonstrantse en Doopgesinde Broederskap). Hierdie oproep word beskou as die mees omvangryke oproep wat nog ooit deur die Wêreldraad uitgestuur is.

Dr. Blake praat van vier leidende beginsels op die agtergrond van die Raad se optrede en sy weiering om in sommige gevalle te reageer.

1. Sy vernaamste bekommernis is om geweld en oorlog te voorkom en om vir vrede te werk as oorlog uitbreek het. „Dit is nie die taak van die Wêreldraad om regter te probeer wees tussen strydende nasionale belange nie”.

2. As die stryd reeds begin het, staan die Wêreldraad onder die verpligting om almal wat gelyk het te

help wat hul politieke situasie, godsdiens of nasionale afkoms ook mag wees.

3. Sommige het die Wêreldraad versoek om kant te kies in hierdie konflik op grond van die oorweging dat dit 'n morele plig is. Waarom daar nie hierop ingegaan is nie vloei voort uit die standpunt dat die Wêreldraad as verteenwoordiger van die ekumeniese beweging, getrou aan die Here Jesus Christus, sy vernaamste verantwoordelikheid beskou as bemiddelaar van versoening tussen die kulturele, konfessionele, ideologiese en nasionale verdeelings van mense en kerke. „Ons beskou nie die Israëli-Arabiese konflik as 'n politieke vraagstuk waarop morele plig ons noodsaak om 'n bepaalde standpunt, voor of téén enige kant, in te neem nie”.

4. Al weet die Wêreldraad dat sy lid-kerke onder druk gekom het om een kant van die stryd te ondersteun, is die strewe van die Wêreldraad om só op te tree dat hy deur alle middele probeer voorkom dat die stryd in die Midde-Ooste vergroot tot 'n nuwe botsing tussen die groot moondhede; dit kan alleen lei tot die verskerping van die spanninge tussen hulle, wat reeds deur die onbesliste stryd in Vietnam aanwesig is.

Die Britse Raad van Kerke neem 'n minder afsydige standpunt in. 'n Besluit van die Uitvoerende Raad meen dat daar drie voorwaardes van belang is vir 'n blywende vrede:

- (a) Die Arabiere moet Israel erken as 'n soewereine staat en
- (b) Israel moet bereid wees om sy grense aan internasionale be- raadslaging te onderwerp en om by te dra tot 'n hervestiging in Israel of elders van alle Ara- biese uitgewekenes.
- (c) 'n Internasionale erkenning en waarborg van 'n ooreenkoms langs hierdie lyne, deur die Verenigde Volke indien moont- lik.

Brittanje en ander nasies moet bereid wees om 'n groot deel van die koste te dra, wat om realities te wees, ook die ekonomiese ont- wikkeling van die hele area insluit.

In **Nederland** het die kerke wat by die Ekumeniese Raad van Kerke in Nederland aangesluit het, saam met die Gereformeerde kerke in Nederland, ook 'n verklaring uitge- reik. Volgens Persbureau der Neder-

landse Hervormde Kerk gee hulle daarin uiting aan hul verontrusting oor die toegenome spanning in die Midde-Ooste en van voorbidding in die kerkdienste en in die persoonlike gebed. „Die huidige bedreiging van die staat Israel en die geweld waar- toe dit nog kan lei, lê 'n sware ver- antwoordelijkheid op die Verenigde Nasies wat meegewerk het aan die totstandkoming van die staat Israel”. Terwyl hulle in gedagte hou die onmeetlike leed wat die Joodse volk in die oorlogsjare ondergaan het, erken die kerke hul betrokke- heid by die vryheid wat aan hierdie volk gegee is om sy eie bestaan op te bou. Hierdie vryheid dreig om nou in ongeregtheid onder te gaan en daarmee word 'n nuwe bedrei- ging geskep vir die vrede van alle volke. Die kerke roep daarom dringend op tot gebed vir die be- houd van die vrede in die Midde-

Ooste en vir die volk van Israel en die lande wat dit omring „sodat Israel in geregtigheid en vrede sy plek onder die volke kan inneem”.

\*

**DIE VERENIGDE KERK VAN CHRISTUS IN JAPAN** (Kyodan) maak hom gereed, in antwoord op 'n uitnodiging van die kerk in For- mosa, om 'n span van ses tot nege predikante voor te berei, wat in September Formosa sal besoek om evangelisasie-prediking te doen. In die verlede het Japan nog altyd preekspanne uit die kerke van Amerika ontvang en ook tydens hierdie somer sal 'n program van evangelisasie deur twee leke-predi- kers van Amerika, twee predikante uit Hawaï en 'n studente-pastoor uit Suid-Oos Asië uitgevoer word. Dit is egter die eerste keer dat die Kyodan na 'n ander land gaan.

## A VISION OF THE NEW EVANGELISM AS THE SOCIALISATION OF GRACE

### II

**THE REV. DERRICK M. NORMAN**

#### TO BE EVANGELISTIC IS TO LIVE ON THE PROMISES OF GOD or EVANGELISM AS HOPE IN ACTION

Dr. Margull is emphatic in stating that “evangelism is not merely the endeavour of the church to save or convert as many as possible. Evangelism can be nothing but simple, loyal, patient, obedient participation in the consummation of the plan which God has for the world which He effects Himself. What God has promised, He creates Himself. Accordingly, mis- sions are God's affair, missions are always God's missions — and we are His servants. The same holds for evangelism. Evangelism is God's affair. It is always God's evangelism and we are His obedient servants.”<sup>12</sup>

What has God promised? He has promised that destruction, death and chaos are not the sum total of reality. That “whatever occurs in reality, in the universe looks promis- ing for God's sake”. Beyond the facts of life is always hope. “Look-

ing at creation not with the eyes of flesh, but with the eyes of faith”. After the act of creation God pro- nounced the world good. He has promised to restore it to its essen- tial goodness.<sup>13</sup>

But not without calling man to share in this redemptive work. He calls men out of bondage. Israel was born of liberation — Yahweh comes to Israel as the Liberator. He who saves from slavery. It is not without significance, and by deliber- ate design, that Jesus Christ bases His mission on words from one of the prophets. (See Luke 4:18, 19). For the prophets defined salvation as the deliverance from a yoke, the redemption from oppression, a free- dom.

So it is fitting that Jesus as the Messiah presents Himself as a Liberator. Zechariah acknowledges that salvation is near in the birth of John the Baptist: “Blessed be the Lord God of Israel, for He has visited and redeemed His people . . .” Luke 1:68. When Jesus is brought into the temple, Simeon takes the baby Jesus into his arms “and blessed God and said, ‘Lord, now

lettest thou thy servant depart in peace, according to thy word; for mine eyes have seen thy salvation’ . . .” Luke 2:28. On the road to Emmaus, two of the disciples express a hope that seemed to be confounded by the event of the Crucifixion of Jesus Christ: “But we had hoped that He was the one to redeem Israel”. Luke 24:21.

**To be evangelistic is to live on these promises of God that the true facts about creation are truth, justice, freedom and peace.** That despite man's rebellion, sin, selfish- ness and pride which brought de- struction, death and chaos in their trail — God has promised, through a covenant of peace, salvation and forgiveness; what Prof. Lehmann calls the “**phenomenon of a second chance**”. These promises are the good news, the Gospel is the Gospel of Shalom. And evangelism “is partic- ipation in Christ's mission to the world”.

Evangelism is hope in action. It is an activity on the part of those who know that God can be trusted to fulfil His promises. And where these “partakers of shalom” preach,



live and serve, there we have the church as a community of Shalom — God's new order. This fellowship says Prof. Hoekendijk "of the partakers of the same salvation is nothing more in this world than a company of strangers and pilgrims . . . , a paroikia."<sup>14</sup> Who say with John Wesley and with Yves Congar that they look upon the world, the wide world, as their paroikia.

These partakers of shalom are a community of the Shalom of God — of the new order. For them evangelism is the establishing of community, of order, of God's new order. Not the establishment of church order, nor as many Christians in the past saw the activity of evangelism: "to be somewhat like a gruelling assault on an entrenched bastion to conquer some souls who would be brought back alive to the fold of the church. D. T. Niles has described this as 'Noah's Ark Evangelism' bringing the animals back into the ark of fellowship with the rest of us."<sup>15</sup>

More truly, evangelism is the establishment of the order of love.

So few Christians are entirely "animated by the Spirit, moved" — as St. Thomas expresses himself — by "the instinct of grace". And it is this instinct of grace which recognizes, with true charity, that everybody, every man belongs somehow to the church — "Wherever someone is searching for Shalom he is on his way to God. He is already visited by God". He has a hope!

### THE NEW EVANGELISM or THE PROBLEM OF HOW TO GET AND TRANSFORM POWER BY THE GRACE OF GOD

In a stimulating and thought provoking essay: ORIGINS OF THE EVANGELICAL REVIVAL, J. D. Walsh makes certain observations about the mood of that age. He says that "despite vigorous attempts at national reformation in the decades 1670—1710 — England was getting less, and no more religious". And asks if the Evangelical Revival was, in one of its many aspects, an attempt by men who despaired of "religious reform from national centre (Convocation, Parliament, Oxford), to achieve national regeneration by missionary work at the provincial circumfer-

ence of the country . . ."<sup>16</sup> Again asking, "Is this partly why Oxford Methodists abandoned learned, doctrinal antiquarianism in favour of simple, popular preaching to the masses?" The content of which is known "in evangelical terminology as the 'doctrines of grace'.<sup>17</sup>

It is interesting to note that the preachers and architects (one and the same) of the Evangelical Revival "shifted their concern from introverted attempts to save their individual souls to an out-going, pragmatic campaign to regenerate a fallen nation". Prof. Walsh asks, "Did they feel that moral conduct and attention to external ordinance were insufficient sanctions for Christian holiness in a wicked age?" And quotes one preacher, Jones of Southward, as stating that "we have preached morality so long, that we have hardly any morality left; and this moral preaching has made our people so very immoral that there are no lengths of wickedness which they are not afraid of running into".<sup>18</sup>

One other observation of Prof. Walsh's concerning the Evangelical Revival, and we get to the point of all this. He asks if the Evangelical Revival and the Oxford Methodists both, were in a way — "a protest against national apostasy and a world of flux?"

The point being that much of this questioning has a parallel in our own times. There is much concern, on the part of evangelists, to make introverted attempts to save individual souls, and equally as much preaching on morality and railing at a people "who grow more and more immoral each day".

What is lacking in much preaching today, and in evangelistic endeavour, is the very element which made the evangelistic awakening of the 1730's and 1740's become the Evangelical Revival: **an understanding of the nature of faith as power.**

Prof. Walsh says that the "Sermons of the 1720's and 40's and 50's — speak little to the soul concerned with the great themes of sin and salvation; they have little of the tragic elements of life". "There was, in short," says Prof. Walsh, "What one might call an ecological gap' which needed to be filled — and was."<sup>19</sup>

An evangelical clergyman by the name of H. Venn spoke for more than just the clergy when he said that, "What we all want is power

to surmount . . . difficulties and . . . assurance of its vouchsafement."<sup>20</sup> Power over difficulties and the assurance that that power was available — this is what the people yearned to possess. Telling them to be holy and free from sin was of little practical value when the people were not directed to the power which makes holy (justifies) and keeps righteous (sanctifies) — the grace of God.

"Evangelicals", says Prof. Walsh, "sought to replace self-righteousness by a vital religion resting on faith in the atoning work of Christ, faith defined not in cognitive terms . . . as assent to certain fundamental dogmas, but as something intuitive, based on a personal relationship between Redeemer and redeemed". The 'godly unrenowned' were the chief target of Gospel preaching.<sup>21</sup>

Another group that was 'reached' by this Gospel preaching were **the disinherited poor**. These are mentioned at this point because the disinherited poor are a yardstick by which to judge the church's faithfulness to God's mission.

We find that Gospel preaching, during the Evangelical Revival, did for the poor indirectly, what poverty programmes (in America) — based largely on economic power and force is seemingly unable to achieve directly. In an article THE CHURCH'S MISSION IN POVERTY AREAS it is said that "poverty cultures lead to chaotic conditions. Poverty cultures consist of — juvenile delinquency, illegitimate births, vandalism, street gangs, robbery, murder, tension and friction, are all outward signs of inward chaos — **lack of an ordered society**". A lack of Shalom.

What the Evangelical Revival achieved in a new form of evangelism — not concerned with individual souls, but a pragmatic campaign to regenerate a fallen nation — was to "preserve order, excite zeal, and resolve doubts". Reaching the individual at a deeper level by creating communities, empowered by grace, which in turn became a force for moral renewal. Community requires a degree of order and people require a sense of community. This was the great achievement of the Evangelical Revival and it might be described by the phrase the **socialization of grace**. (Charles Davis: The Church of Christ is essentially the visibility of grace, namely, the visible model and witness of that interpersonal communion amongst

men which is the gift of salvation. (The Observer Review, 1.1.67, p.21).

The Methodist societies, which were established to shepherd the converts of the Revival were exactly what the disinherited poor needed — a sense of community, a degree of order. These societies were the Church as community, as the community of the Shalom of God — of the new order. The new evangelism, or the relevant evangelism (and irrelevant evangelism is no evangelism) is really the solution of the problem of how to get and transform power by the grace of God.

Holding to the broad definition of power as the capacity to do things, to act, to effect change.

The secret of the Evangelical Revival was in the words of John Wesley "the uniting of knowledge and vital piety". Robert M. MacIver says: "The power of man to achieve his ends has been the product of the combination of knowledge with energy..."<sup>22</sup>

Our times are characterised by an explosion of knowledge, of theology and neo-theologies, and a lack of vital piety, or moral energy, or the power of grace.

The new evangelism will concern itself with power. It will not be a series of introverted attempts to save individual souls, but by **creating communities of power for those who have no power, it will effect a man's salvation at a deeper and more enduring level.** It will release powers for holiness and health, rather than stagnate latent power by a negative exhibition of Christian living which is compounded by a wall of don'ts.

All the implications of this description of evangelism as the "socialization of grace" are not clear to this writer, and the paper (like most sermons) ends where it should begin. Yet this writer believes that the point is valid. That there is a general awakening (secular and religious) to the fact "that no one has real power to shape his own life". This is an observation by one of the 'young radicals' who goes on to say that "people need institutions that belong to them, that they can experiment with and shape. In that process it's possible to develop new forms for activity which can provide new models for how people can work together so participants can think radically about how society could operate".<sup>23</sup>

This comes too close to a plea

for the institutional nature of the church to be kept as a structure for experiment, to not make that point. The fault is not with the church as institution, so much as **the failure to utilise the institutional church as an instrument of, and for, social change.** As a power in the land! MacIver says that "organization properly exists to serve not its own ends, but the ends of the persons who compose it or control it". This description has some real dangers which are readily apparent. The Church does all too often serve the ends of those persons who control it, and that end has usually been "social compatibility". Yet if we are to take seriously the deliberate use Christ made of the words of Isaiah's prophecy about the function of the Messiah — to bring good news to the poor, to liberate the captives then we must go a little further and say with MacIver. "The Organization is an agency, a means, a system sustained by its members for their service. Its virtue, its sole virtue, is the service it renders".

If evangelism is to be hope in action, then the church must move into areas where there are people, poor people, but no sense of community, and by being there **create the hope of community** by the sustaining promises of God — that where "two or three are gathered together, in my name, there am I in the midst of them".

Mission or evangelism, is being obedient to God. Obedience means

being aware of the world and being aware of the knowledge of God in Jesus Christ and sharing in Christ's ministry of healing, preaching and suffering.

"We are failing" says one person, "to administer the grace of God to poverty-culture man". The church has lost the art of being able to socialize grace. Or as the poet Dylan Thomas wrote:

"Love puts its arms around the griefs of the age", — and thus poetically described the action of God in Jesus Christ, which action gave men 'a future and hope'.

12. Hope in Action p. xi.
13. Lectures — J. C. Hoekendijk.
14. Hope in Action p.181.
15. Claimed by God for Mission — E. L. Stockwell p.29.
16. Essays in Modern Church History — ed. by G. V. Bennett and J. D. Walsh p.140.
17. Ibid. p.133.
18. Ibid. p.140, 141.
19. Essays in Modern Church History, ed. G. V. Bennett and A. and C. Black, J. D. Walsh, p.143.
20. Ibid. p.143.
21. Ibid. p.143.
22. Power transformed — Robert M. MacIver, p.123.
23. Raising the Question of Who Decides by Casey Hayden in the New Republic's series on Thoughts of Young Radicals, Jan. 22, 66, p.9, 10.

#### Bibliography

- Abbott, Walter M. (gen.ed): The Documents of Vatican II Association Press 1966.
- Bennett, G. V. ed.: Essays in Modern Church History.
- Walsh, J. D. ed.: A. & C. Black 1966.
- Congar, Yves: The Wide World My Parish. Helicon Press 1961.
- Hoekendijk, J. C.: The Church Inside Out. Westminster 1966.
- Margull, Hans, J.: Hope in Action. Muhlenberg 1962.
- Newman, Jeremiah: Change and the Catholic Church. Helicon Press 1965.
- Stockwell, Eugene L.: Claimed by God for Mission. World Outlook Press 1965.

## Boekbespreking

### BELANGWEKKENDE BOEKWERK OOR GENESIS

DR. A. VAN SELMS, *Genesis* (Twee dele) in die nuwe serie *De Prediking van het Oude Testament*, uitgegee deur G. F. Callenbach, Nijkerk, 1967.

Die verskyning van hierdie uitlegging van die eerste Bybelboek is 'n gebeurtenis wat deur alle liefhebbers van die Woord toegejuig en verwelkom sal word. Dit is die eersteling in 'n nuwe kommentare-serie op die boeke van die Ou Testament wat onder redaksie staan van prof. A. van Selms, alombekende hoogleraar in Semitiese tale aan die Universiteit van Pretoria, en prof. A. S. van der Woude, hoogleraar in Ou Testament aan die Rijksuniversiteit te Gro-

ningen, 'n hoogaangeskrewe jong teoloog uit ons stamland Nederland.

Die samestelling van die redaksie is (en twee redes 'n besonder gelukkige: Eerstens beteken dit 'n saamspan van kragte uit twee lande (sewe uit Suid-Afrika), en tweedens bring dit mee 'n vrugbare en heilsame koppeling tussen twee nou-skakelende vakgebiede, nl. die Ou Testament en die Semitiese Tale.

Die eerste vrug van hierdie koppeling is die feit dat daar gebreek word met die tradisionele wyse waarop kommentare op die Bybel gewoonlik opgeset word. In prof. Van Selms se opset staan die eksegeese van die teks, behandel in perikope, voorop as die allesbepalende faktor waarop alle afleidings en gevolgtrekkings behoort te berus. Daarom word die eksege-

tiese gedeelte nie voorafgegaan nie, maar gevolg deur 'n letterkundige analise van die betrokke perikoop en daarna bied hy dan ook die prediking van elke gedeelte. Hierdie metode bring dan ook mee dat hy nie aan die begin van die boek 'n inleiding op die Bybelboek bied nie, maar wel 'n slotbeskouing aan die einde van die hele werk. Dit getuig van die handhawing van 'n baie belangrike beginsel — die erkenning van die soewereine gesag van dit wat daar staan, vry van 'n vooropgesette beskouing, vry van 'n subjektiewe opvatting waardeur die uitlegging in 'n dwangbuis sou kon geraak. Om hierdie rede al is hierdie kommentaar belangwekkend en belangrik. Dié metode in sigself is 'n veiligheidsmaatreël wat sorg dat suiwere ekse-gese beoefen word, en 'n voorsorgmaatreël wat die eksegeet behoed vir die gevaar dat subjektiewe, sistematiese veronderstellings die eksegese sou bepaal en beheers. Dit sal elke gebruiker van hierdie boekwerk opval dat hier 'n eksegeet aan die werk is wat die vryheid van die eksegeet as beginsel handhaaf, maar dan 'n vryheid wat noodwendig insluit verantwoordelike gebondenheid aan die skrifwoord, en 'n eerlike, ernstige soeke na die waarheid.

### VERNUWING

Dit alles bring mee dat die werk 'n totale vernuwing beteken: daar waar 'n verrassend-frisse lug deur die geheel en nêrens word die leser beklem deur vermoënde napsatery van wat al oor en oor deur ander gesê is nie, of deur slaafse navolging van tradisionele, geïkte opvattinge nie. Die outeur se eksegese lei hom tot 'n geheel nuwe siening van die histories-kritiese probleme van die eerste Bybelboek, en dwing hom tot nuwe konklusies oor die aard, samestelling en bedoeling van Genesis, oor die skrywer en oor die ontstaanstyd van die boek. Hierdie konklusies is sodanig dat mens inderdaad kan praat van 'n rewolusie op die gebied van die Genesis-uitleg. Hy kom tot die slotsom dat ons te doen het met die geniale werk van één skrywer, 'n tydgenoot van Salomo, wat vir die komposisie van sy werk gebruik gemaak het van 'n aantal geskrewe, ouer dokumente, en van verskillende mondelinge oorleweringe, buite-Israelitiese sowel as die wat in Israel self van

geslag tot geslag oorgelewer is. Daar word dus finaal gebreek met die gebruik-geworde metode van bronnesekeiding en met die daarmee saamhangende opvattinge oor outeurskap en datering van die boek. Die tradisionele bronnesekeiding is iets wat sy tyd gehad het, want na bestudering van hierdie boekwerk, kan mens nie meer daardie metode met soveel stelligheid beaam soos wat tot nou toe vry algemeen gedoen is nie. Dit spreek vanself dat hierdie boek teen-spraak sal uitlok en moontlik ook heftige diskussies — as dit die geval sal wees, sal dit alleen maar heilsaam wees, want, soos die skrywer self sê (deel I, bl. 14) sal dit wenslik wees

om die gesprek opnuut te begin oor baie dinge wat tot nou toe aanvaar is.

Dit is onmoontlik om in hierdie kort bespreking die aandag te vestig op die talle nuwe sieninge en die rykdom van belangrike nuwe vertolkings en die skat van kennis — dit kan die leser liever self gaan ontdek. Ek kan hom die versekering gee dat die lees van dié twee boekele vir my persoonlik 'n genot was, in die eerste plek om die ryke inhoud, en in die tweede plek om die glashelderheid en vlotleesbaarheid. Dit is 'n werk wat geen teoloog durf oor die hoof sien nie en wat nie in sy boek-rak mag ontbreek nie. C.J.L.

## BRIEWE - LETTERS

### STEP OFF AT ROME!

*Mr. J. A. DUIGAN, Pretoria.*

I do not intend any further extension of my reference to the Papacy except to express surprise at the attitude taken up by the Rev. Moulder (P.V., August). After criticising the Pope for not specifying in detail the amount he was giving for the relief of hunger, Mr. Moulder now says "the amount given by the Vatican is *beside the point*"! His solution to the world problem of hunger and illiteracy is, "stop wasting money on clergy and religious paraphernalia; liquidate land and buildings which only serve us and not a wider community. How then will he and his fellow ministers live without money? Must ministers dispense with houses which serve to shelter them only — and not a wider community? I hope that when he has completed his overseas studies he will have acquired a more practical approach to the world-wide tragedy of poverty. Maybe on his return journey he will be able to step off at Rome and advise the Pope, particularly in regard to disposing of "holy rubbish" as he calls it! I am grateful however that he is prepared to let the Vatican remain — as an Art gallery.

### SORRY, MR. HARKER

*DAVID PERK, Johannesburg.*

I feel humbled by Mr. Harker's outstanding record of 21 years of

exertions in the cause of inter-racial understanding and harmony, and I would ask him to forgive me if he felt any disparagement in the sentence he quotes. It was certainly not my intention, and perhaps I should have expressed myself in a manner that sounded less "presumptuous". All I sought to convey was that, under existing conditions, the politico-social answer to the problem of inter-racial relationships would be greatly advanced and enhanced by the ecumenical effort of the Church.

### "KERKLIKE APARTHEID"

*Mr. A. J. J. BURGER, Marie, Pk. Witelsi.*

Daar is mooi gedagtes in die getuigenis van dr. H. Francois Möller, *Enkele Gedagtes oor my Godsdienst* (Pro Veritate, Julie 1967). Waar die skrywer egter aan die einde van sy artikel die indruk wek as sou aparte aanbidding sonder meer liefdeloos wees, is ek weer van mening dat dit beter is om so 'n omstrede vraagstuk uiters versigtig te benader.

Kleursekeiding was nog altyd vir ons volk 'n gevoelige en kommervolle vraagstuk. Politieke wetgewing en sinodale besluite getuig daarvan. In sommige van ons kerke het aparte aanbidding byna die krag van 'n ekstra belydenisartikel. Daarby is daar ekstremistiese predikante in die Ned. Geref. Kerk wat in hulle propaganda teen die Christelike Instituut van S.A. nie skroom om ons van integrasie te beskuldig nie. Daarom

vrees ek dat so 'n uitlating soos dié van dr. Möller in die huidige situasie tot meer wanvoorstellinge aanleiding kan gee, terwyl die groot vraag tog is: Is *verpligte* kerklike apartheid Skriftuurlik of nie?

Ons wil ons tog maar net aan die suiwere waarheid van Gods Woord hou. Ek glo dat sparte aanbidding deur die verskillende rasse die beste praktiese reëling is onder ons omstandighede; maar ek glo ook dat ek my mede-Christen dan nog net so lief kan hê asof ons saam aanbid.

Het u al gekyk na die foto's van ons Sendingmoderature? Dit lyk nie baie na kerklike apartheid nie en dit weerspieël vir my 'n pragtige gesindheid. So sien ek graag die Kerk van die Here. Nou kom die vraag op: Waarom soveel verdeeldheid en onaangenaamheid oor iets wat nie gevaar inhou nie? Ons Bantokerke vra nie „integrasië” nie. Waarom moet

sommige predikante hierdie politieke spook so vrees? Ja, hulle gaan nog verder en saai agterdog en verdagmaking teen mede-Christene wat die Heilige Skrif anders verstaan en verklaar, en hulle beroep hulle vir hierdie agitatie en diskriminasie nie op die Woord van God nie, maar op sinodale besluite.

Persoonlik kan ek getuig dat ek baie aangename herinneringe in my omdra van dienste van gekleurdes wat ek bygewoon het, ook waar hulle as bediendes onder my gewerk het. Ek sal die Here altyd dank vir hulle mooi voorbeeld en getuienis. As die redakteur my sal toelaat, vertel ek later daarvan. (*U word hartlik daar-toe uitgenooi.—Red.*)

Nog iets oor die volgende sja wat in dr. Möller se artikel voorkom: „Onlangs het 'n dominee aan my gesê dat daar oor 50 jaar in ons land nie meer iets soos ras sal wees nie.”

Dit lyk vir my maar baie swartgallig. Het God ons dan nie aan hierdie suidpunt van Afrika as 'n blanke nasie laat ontwikkel nie? Glo ons nie dat Hy dit juis so beskik het sodat ons as Christenvolk tot seën vir die swart heidenvolke kon wees nie? As Hy Israel (Juda) deur die eeue te midde van vervolging en uitmoording as volk behou het, dan sal ons Hom nie eer as ons Hom nie vertrou nie. Wat dr. Möller se dominee vrees, sal alleenlik kan gebeur as ons heeltemal afvallig word van God. Daarom te meer moet dit ons erns wees om die heilsboodskap met vuur en ywer, vroeg en laat, tydig en ontydig by ons mense tuis te bring. Die kind so-wel as die ouer moet vir die Here behou word, en so vir ons volk. Dan sal daar ook nie so baie „kommuniatiese simposiums” nodig wees nie. 'n Volk wat van binne geestelik verrot is, word nie so gered nie.