

PRO

VERITATE



AUGUSTUS 1973

By die poskantoor
as nuusblad ingeskryf

I N H O U D

| | |
|---|----|
| REDAKSIONEEL: ONS KLA AN ... | 1 |
| EDITORIAL: WE ACCUSE ... | 1 |
| THE STAND OF THE C.I. EXECUTIVE | 4 |
| TOWARDS EQUALITY IN EDUCATION | 5 |
| STRYD RONDOM SYDNEY | 9 |
| "GIVE YOUR HEART TO JESUS AND THE WORLD WILL COME RIGHT"? | 11 |
| CHURCH BRINGS CHANGE? | 15 |
| LETTERS TO THE EDITOR: | 13 |
| "GOVERNMENTAL VIOLENCE" OR "GOVERNMENTAL RETALIATION"? | |
| CAPITALISM, SOCIALISM AND APARTHEID | |
| COMMON WORSHIP | |
| A TASK FOR WOMEN | |
| A CONFESSING CHURCH IN S.A.? | 16 |
| THEOLOGY AND SENSITIVITY TRAINING | 18 |
| GEWEEG EN ...?/WEIGHED AND ...? | 21 |
| (WILGESPRUIT AND THE TWO INVESTIGATIONS) | |

VOORBLADFOTO

DIE UITVOERENDE STAF VAN DIE CHRISTELIKE INSTITUUT WAT BESLUIT HET OM TE WEIER OM VOOR DIE SCHLEBUSCHKOMMISSIE TE GETUIG. VAN LINKS NA REGS: DS. BRIAN BROWN, ROELF MEYER, DS. THEO KOTZE, MEV. JANE PHAKATI EN DR. BEYERS NAUDE—'N VERSLAG VAN DIE SUNDAY TIMES HIEROOR IS IN HIERDIE UITGAWE OPGENEEM. (DIE FOTO IS GOEDGUNSTIGLIK DEUR DIE SUNDAY TIMES VERSKAF).

COVER PHOTOGRAPH

THE CHRISTIAN INSTITUTE LEADERSHIP WHICH HAS DECIDED TO REFUSE TO TESTIFY BEFORE THE SCHLEBUSCH COMMISSION. FROM LEFT TO RIGHT: THE REV. BRIAN BROWN, ROELF MEYER, THE REV. THEO KOTZE, MRS. JANE PHAKATI AND DR. BEYERS NAUDE—THE REPORT OF THE SUNDAY TIMES ABOUT THIS IS INCLUDED IN THIS EDITION. (PHOTOGRAPH BY COURTESY OF THE SUNDAY TIMES.)

SUBSCRIPTION payable in advance. Surface mail S.A. and S.W.A. R3, airmail R4.20. Surface mail African States and Rhodesia R3.50, airmail R6. Seamail United Kingdom and Europe R3.50, airmail R6. Seamail America R3.50, airmail R7. Cheques and postal orders to be made payable to Pro Veritate (Pty) Ltd., P.O. Box 31135, Braamfontein, Transvaal. Price per single copy 25c.

NEDERLAND: Zeepost f 14.50, Luchtpost-editie f 24.50. Alle Betalingen voor Pro Veritate of het Christelijk Instituut voor Z.A. kunnen geschieden op Giro 8685 t.n.v. de Generale Diaconale Raad der Ned. Herv. Kerk te Utrecht—met opgave doel der betaling.

PLEASE NOTE: The Editorial Staff of Pro Veritate are not responsible for opinions and standpoints which appear in any article of this monthly other than those in the editorial and editorial statements. Printed by: Golden Era Printers and Stationers (Pty) Ltd., 44 Pine Avenue, Fordsburg, Johannesburg.

PRO VERITATE appears on the 15th of every month.

ONS KLA AAN...

DIE CHRISTELIKE INSTITUUT is dié maand tien jaar aan die werk en Pro Veritate is reeds in sy elfde verskyningsjaar. Betekenisvolle Christelike aksie, getuienis, waarskuwings, riglyne en visie is gedurende die tyd van die bestaan van die C.I. en P.V. tot Suid-Afrika gerig. So pas het byvoorbeeld drie brosjures van die C.I., as 'n riglyn vir die positiewe Christelike inrigting van die samelewing, die lig gesien. Spro-cas se ses verslae op verskillende vlakke van die samelewing, opvoeding, sosiale omgang, wet, die kerk, die ekonomie en die politiek spel riglyne uit as 'n alternatief vir apartheid. Ander publikasies kan genoem word en dan is die aksie-programme nog nie eens genoem nie. Daar is inderdaad veel deur die jare gedoen om Suid-Afrika te probeer verander sodat dit 'n samelewing kan behels waar vrede, geregtigheid en vertrouwe seëvier.

DIE HAND IN EIE BOESEM

Tog as 'n mens na die situasie kyk en besef dat die toekomst alles behalwe rooskleurig vir die land lyk, moet erken word dat veel meer gedoen kon en moes gewees het. Daar kon meer persoonlike opofferings gemaak word, en groter identifikasie met dié wat verwerp word, dié teenoor wie gediskrimineer word. In 'n mens se eie optrede, leefwyse, gesindheid en ideale het altyd nog veel gekort. As die hand eerlik in eie boesem gesteek word, word dit duidelik dat 'n mens selfs baie keer gefaal het en staan jy skuldig sodat veel van die onreg en dit wat verantwoordelik is vir dié verslegtende situasie ook op jou rekening staan. Daarvoor moet verantwoordelikheid geneem word.

Wie is vir die verslegtende situasie verantwoordelik? Sonder om eie skuld te probeer afskuif, moet sommige groepe tog uitgesonder word soos *die Engels-sprekendes, die Afrikaners, die kerke, en die regering.*

Is dit nie waar dat *die Engels-sprekendes* in Suid-Afrika in 'n groot mate passief is ten opsigte van daadwerklike aksie vir geregtigheid in Suid-Afrika nie? Miskien verskil baie met apartheid en die voorstanders daarvan, maar hulle is tog baie dankbaar daarvoor, veral wanneer dit hulle ekonomiese belange bevorder. Ook die Engels-sprekende oor die algemeen moet opgeroep word om verantwoording te doen vir sy skuld aan die situasie. Skuld van 'n passiewe toeskouer terwyl hy die voordele van die situasie geniet waar veel onreg gepleeg word en waaraan hy ook meedoen.

Die Afrikaner dra oor die algemeen die skuld dat hy gedwonge apartheid daadwerklik aktief gesteun en goedgekeur het. 'n Diepe vrees vir sy eie ondergang het hom gemotiveer sodat hy bereid was om mee te werk om veel diskriminasie, onreg, liefdeloosheid en ongeregtheid in die strukture en wette van die land vas te lê.

Die kerk oor die algemeen in Suid-Afrika staan skuldig omdat hy 'n valse, onbybelse skeiding en teenstelling tussen die „geestelike” en die „politieke” sy van die lewe gemaak het. Die gevolg was dat die kerk eintlik slegs bekommerd oor die „siel” van die mens was en nie ook die evangelie op die samelewing in woord en

WE ACCUSE...

THIS MONTH SEES the tenth year of the activities of the Christian Institute and the eleventh in the life of Pro Veritate. During these years the C.I. and P.V. have directed meaningful Christian action, witness, warning, guiding-lines and vision towards South Africa. Recently, for example, the C.I. has issued three brochures as directives towards the establishment of a positive Christian community. The six Spro-cas reports on the different levels of the community, education, social intercourse, law, the church, the economy and politics, spell out guiding-lines for an alternative to apartheid. Other publications could be referred to, not to mention the programme of action. A lot has in truth been done throughout the years to try and change South Africa into a community where peace, justice and trust prevail.

SEARCHING OUR HEARTS

Yet, when we assess the situation and realise that the future looks anything but rosy, we have to admit that more could have, and should have, been done—more personal sacrifices, greater identification with those who are rejected, those who are discriminated against. Our own conduct, way of life, disposition and ideals have never been adequate. If we honestly searched our own hearts, it would become clear that we have often failed, that we are also guilty and that we must also carry blame for some of the injustice and for that which has contributed to the deteriorating situation. We must accept this responsibility.

Who is responsible for the deteriorating situation? Without trying to shift the blame, we must nevertheless identify some groups such as *the English-speaking, the Afrikaner, the churches and the government.*

It is not true that the English-speaking people in South Africa are to a great extent passive as regards real action towards justice in South Africa. Perhaps many of them oppose apartheid and its advocates, but are nevertheless thankful for it especially when it benefits their economic interests. English-speaking people generally must also be called to account and answer for their blame in the situation. Blame accrues to a passive observer enjoying the advantages of the situation in which great injustice is done and in which he also participates.

The Afrikaner generally must carry the blame for having indeed actively supported and approved of enforced apartheid. A deep fear of his own ruin motivated him to be willing to be a party to the establishment of great discrimination, injustice, lack of love and unrighteousness in the structures and laws of the country.

The church, generally, in South Africa is guilty because it has made a false, unbiblical division and anti-thesis between the “spiritual” and the “political” aspects of life. The result was that the church was only concerned with the “soul” of a person and did not also apply the gospel in word and deed to the community.

daad toegepas het nie. Die gevolg daarvan was dat die wit kerkmens heel dikwels 'n kerkengel op Sondag geword het en in die politiek in die week liefdeloos met wêreldse maatstawe opgetree het. Met uitsonderinge moet die klag teen die kerk in Suid-Afrika gemaak word dat hy die status quo van blanke voorreg en rykdom teenoor swart onreg en armoede gehandhaaf het en nie omvattend en diepgaande met die evangelie in die maatskappy en politiek betrokke was nie.

DIE REGERING WORD TOT VERANTWOORDING GEROEP ...

Al is dit so dat veel individuele groepe vir die situasie verantwoordelik gehou kan word, is dit eintlik die strukture van die samelewing en dié wat dit vasstel, wat die lewe in Suid-Afrika beheer en in 'n bepaalde rigting stuur. As die regering dan in hierdie verband genoem word, sluit dit ook dié in wat hom in stand hou.

Die apartheidsregering wat ten alle koste sy liefdelose beleid ten uitvoer wil bring, moet egter tot halt geroep word en voor die hoogste gesag, Jesus Christus, tot verantwoording geroep word. Die regering moet daarvoor aanspreeklik gehou word dat dit sy beleid en die metodes wat in die toepassing daarvan gebruik word, is wat vir die haglike situasie en die dreigende onheil verantwoordelik is:

Hý veroorsaak *polarisasie* tussen swart en wit; hý skep toestande wat 'n ryke teëlaarde vir goddelose *Kommunisme* skep; hý pleeg *onreg* in die naam van reg deur wetgewing; hý pleeg *geweld* teen onskuldige mense; hý *misbruik sy vryheid* deur in die private lewens in te gryp en mense te „ontmens“; hý veroorsaak die „*geestelike*“ dood van politieke gevangenes, ingeperktes (sonder verhoor), dié wat verban is en hulle dierbares; hý *frustreer* mense doelbewus en onnodiglik, en veroorsaak *haat-, wraak- en wrokgevoelens* deur afneming van paspoorte, verbanning van leiers van organisasies en die onbillike en onchristelike „*ondersoek*“ deur 'n parlementêre kommissie.

IN GOD SE PLEK

Die regering staan skuldig—en die afgelope 25 jaar se geskiedenis in die vorm van die wetsboek, die toepassing daarvan en die totalitaristiese optrede van die regering, veral in die laaste tyd, dien as verdoemende getuïenis. Elke gelowige moet nou in die Naam van die hoogste gesag, soos die profete in die ou tyd bv. gedoen het, in die pad van die geweldadige en meedoënlose tirannie van 'n onderdrukkende beleid en dié wat daarvoor verantwoordelik is, gaan staan om hulle van hulle ongeregtigheid tot bekering te roep. Die evangelie leer versoening, genesing, liefde, gemeenskap, eenheid, vrede, aanvaarding en vertroue. Die regering veroorsaak polarisasie, wonde, haat, vervreemding, verdeeldheid, bitterheid, rassisme en verwerping.

Hý probeer homself in God se plek stel deur finaal oor mense-lewens te wil beskik en nuwe norme van geregtigheid daar te stel. Hý besluit waar mense mag woon en nie mag woon nie (vgl. die verbroekeling van gesinne); wie met wie mag trou en wie nie; wie sy Godgegewe talente in arbeid *ten volle* mag gebruik en wie nie; wie vry mag rondbeweeg en wie nie (vgl. die paswette, die ingeperktes en die politieke gevangenes);

Therefore white churchgoers often became Sunday saints but during the week acted unlovingly and according to worldly political standards. With some exceptions the church in South Africa must be charged in that it has maintained the status quo between white privileged and wealth, and black injustice and poverty, without concerning itself comprehensively and deeply with the gospel in society and politics.

THE GOVERNMENT IS CALLED UPON TO ANSWER FOR ...

Even if it were so that many individual groups could be held responsible for the situation, it is in fact the structure of the society and those who determine it who control and direct it in a certain way. If the government is mentioned in this respect, it must also include those who keep it in power.

This apartheid-government which must at all costs carry out its loveless policy must be called to a halt and be called to account before the highest authority, Jesus Christ. The government must answer for its policy, and the methods used in enforcing this policy being responsible for this perilous situation and threatened disaster:-

This government causes the *polarisation* between black and white; this government creates the right climate for the cultivation of godless *communism*; this government by legislation commits *injustice* in the name of justice; this government uses *violence* against innocent people; this government *misuses its freedom* by interfering in the private lives of people and dehumanising them; the government causes the „*spiritual*“ death of political prisoners, those who are banned (without trial), those who are deported, as well as of their dear ones; the government *frustrates* people deliberately and unnecessarily and creates feelings of hate, vengeance and rancour by confiscating passports, banning leaders of organisations and by unreasonable and unchristian „*investigations*“ by a Parliamentary Commission.

IN GOD'S PREROGATIVE

The government is culpable. The history of the past 25 years in the shape of statutes, their application and the totalitarian governmental action, especially lately, serve as the damning evidence. The time has come for every believer to stand in the Name of the highest authority, like the prophets of old, against the violent and merciless tyranny of a suppressive policy and those who are responsible for it. They must be converted from their unrighteousness. The gospel teaches reconciliation, healing, love, communion, unity, peace, acceptance and trust. The government causes polarisation, injuries, hate, estrangement, dissension, bitterness, racism and rejection.

It has tried to usurp God's place by making the final ruling over people's lives and by establishing new norms of justice. The government decides where people may or may not live (cf. the breaking-up of families); who may or may not get married to whom; who may or may not in his work, use his God-given talent, *to the full*; who may and who may not move around freely (cf. pass laws, banned people and political prisoners); who may and who may not possess God-given property (cf. the tenure of land and houses on it); who,

wie mag Godgegewe eiendom (vgl. grondbesit en huise daarop) besit en wie nie; wie volgens sy apartheidskode gebrandmerk staan as kommuniste, rebelle, ongehoorsames, opstandelinge; wie misdadigers is en wie nie (vgl. byna 2 000 wat daagliks by die howe oor paswetgewing aangekla word).

'N VALSE EVANGELIE

Apartheid moet ontmasker word vir wat dit werklik is:

'n *Valse evangelie*—die hoogste norm is die handhawing van jou blanke identiteit, mag en voorreg; die valse god is rasse-identiteit; die mag van die sisteem is strukturele en polisiegeweld; die motto wat heers, is dat jy jouself, jou kultuur, jou volk, jou eie moet liefhê ten koste van jou naaste; die „kerk” is wit Suid-Afrika en die teks is „hou Suid-Afrika blank”.

Wat dié situasie nog vererger is dat die regering bekend staan as 'n „Christelike regering” en dié beskrywing vir hulle toe-eien. Tog getuig die evangelie dat 'n goeie boom nie slegte vrugte kan dra nie en as die vrugte, gevolge, en die uitwerking van die beleid van apartheid aan die evangelie getoets word, moet die „Christelikheid” van die hele stelsel ten sterkste bevraagteken word.

God verwag stellig gehoorsaamheid van onderdane aan die regering, maar dit beteken tog eintlik in die eerste plek gehoorsaamheid aan God, wat die hoogste gesag is. Indien 'n owerheid nou self 'n „kwaaddoener” word, (vergelyk Romeine 13 en Openbaring 13), moet God eerder as die mens gehoorsaam word.

'N ONDERSOEK NA APARTHEID EN SY REGERING

Die beleid en toepassing van die apartheidspolitiek het diepe onrus binne en buite die land veroorsaak en volgens alle tekens stuur ons op krisis na krisis af. Wat ons land nou dringend nodig het, is nie 'n ondersoek na sekere organisasies nie, maar in opvolging van die deeglike ondersoek en beoordeling van apartheid deur die Spro-cas-reeks, die sameroeping van 'n nasionale konvensie. Daar behoort verteenwoordigers van alle rasse die geleentheid te kry om aan sinvolle samesprekings deel te neem vir oplossings van die landsprobleme wat vir alle rasse aanvaarbaar sou wees.

Dié saak is van die allergrootste belang omdat *die regering in sy beleid 'n bedreiging vir die veiligheid van die staat geword het*. Geweld gaan van buite teen Suid-Afrika toeneem en binnelands kan die regering slegs met groter arbitrêre maatreëls en gebruikmaking van geweld die posisie handhaaf. God roep elkeen om verantwoordelikheid vir sy lewe en dié van sy naaste, sy land en omstandighede te neem. *Nou* moet ons alles wat onchristelik, ongeregverdig, onbillik, liefdeloos en gevaarlik vir die mense in Suid-Afrika is, verwerp en dit met Christelike geregtigheid, liefde, vrede en verantwoordelikheid vervang.

Die wese van ons sonde is dat ons nie praktiese Christelike liefde tussen wit en swart in Suid-Afrika bepleit het wat ook die politiek en die maatskappy insluit nie. Daarvan roep God ons na hom terug: „Geliefdes laat ons mekaar liefhê ... hy wat nie liefhet nie, het God nie geken nie, want God is liefde” (1 John. 4:7,8).



according to his apartheid code, gets branded as a communist, rebel, disobedient, reactionary; who are and who are not criminals (cf. nearly 2 000 who are charged in court daily according to the pass laws).

A FALSE GOSPEL

Apartheid must be shown in its true colours:

A *false gospel*—the highest priority is to maintain your white identity, power and privilege. The false god is racial identity; the power of the system is structural and police violence; the reigning motto is to love yourself, your culture, your people, and what is yours above all, even at the cost of your neighbour; the “Church” is European South Africa and the text is “keep South Africa white”.

The situation is aggravated by the fact that the government is known as a “Christian government” and calls itself such. And yet the gospel testifies that a sound tree cannot bear evil fruit and if the fruits, the consequences and the effects of the policy of apartheid are tested by the gospel, the “Christianness” of the whole system must be strongly questioned.

God surely expects the citizen to be obedient to the government, but this does mean in the first place obedience to God, who is the highest authority. But if the governing authorities themselves become “evildoers” (cf. Romans 13 and Revelation 13) then God must be obeyed rather than man.

AN INVESTIGATION OF APARTHEID AND ITS GOVERNMENT

The policy and application of the apartheid “politique” has caused deep disquiet within the country and without. All the signs show that we are heading for crisis upon crisis. What our country desperately needs right now is not investigations into certain organisations, but the calling together of a national convention as a follow-up of the thorough investigations and judgement of apartheid by the Spro-cas series. Representatives of all races should be given the opportunity to take part in meaningful discussions seeking solutions for the problems of the country which will be acceptable to all races.

This matter is of the greatest importance, because *the governmental policy has become a threat to the security of the State*. Violence from without the country against South Africa is going to increase. Within the country the government can only maintain the position by means of greater arbitrary measures and the use of violence. God calls every person to accept responsibility for his life and that of his neighbour, his country and circumstances. We must *now* reject everything which is unchristian, unjust, unreasonable, without love and dangerous to the people of South Africa and replace it with Christian justice, love, peace and responsibility.

Our sin in essence is that we have not pleaded for practical Christian love between white and black in South Africa which would also include politics and the society. God calls us away from this: Beloved, let us love one another ... He who does not love does not know God; for God is love (1 John 4:7,8).



The Stand of the C.I. Executive

**Absence of key witnesses
may cripple inquiry**

**NAUDE'S TOP FIVE WILL
DEFY SCHLEBUSCH**

**LEADERS WON'T PAY FINES—PREPARED
TO GO TO JAIL**

The top five members of the Christian Institute yesterday told the Sunday Times that they had decided unanimously to refuse to testify at the Schlebusch Commission investigation into the organisation.

Defiance of the Schlebusch Commission will make them liable to up to six months imprisonment or heavy fines. But I understand that if they are prosecuted and fined as a result of their conscience stand, they will refuse to pay and accept the consequences.

Their decision deprives the Schlebusch Commission of key witnesses and makes adequate investigation of the Christian Institute almost impossible.

The five—who comprise the executive staff of the Institute—include:

Dr. C.F. Beyers Naudé, 57, a member of the Nederduitse Gereformeerde Kerk and a former dominee. He is director of the Christian Institute.

The Rev. Theo Kotzé, 53, a Methodist clergyman and Cape regional director of the Christian Institute.

The Rev. Brian Brown, 34, a Methodist clergyman and administrative director of the Christian Institute.

Mrs. Jane Phakathi, 41, a Seventh Day Adventist and community organiser of the Christian Institute.

The Rev. Roelf Meyer, 36, a member of the Dutch Reformed Church who is editor of the Institute's journal, *Pro Veritate*, and also study secretary.

JUDICIARY

In a joint statement to the SUNDAY TIMES yesterday, the five explained their stand and stressed that their decision has been made on grounds of conscience and not because they have anything to hide.

They also delivered a stinging rebuke to the United Party for its participation in the Schlebusch Commission.

The executive group has decided to obey subpoenas to appear before the Commission, then to refuse to testify. Their stand makes them liable to up to six months imprisonment or heavy fines.

—*Caroline Clark*
Sunday Times, 12.8.73

THE STATEMENT READS

We who have appended our names to this statement wish to make known our resolve not to testify before the Schlebusch Commission, even if subpoenaed to do so.

As followers of Christ, we accept and wish to obey Him as our highest authority, and therefore we regard any co-operation in this matter to be a betrayal of our Lord. This stand is in accord with the recent manifesto for "Christian Change" published by the Institute, which states: "Law and Government are subject to the Gospel of Christ and injustice and totalitarian activities must be rejected. Faced by unchristian laws, Christians should obey God rather than man."

We wish to reiterate the call of the Christian Institute to the Government to respect the due process of law and not to disregard the judiciary in this matter. The Government having appointed a Commission which by its mandate undermines the democratic procedure and the rule of law, we are not prepared to acquiesce in this.

No citizen who has the cause of truth and justice at heart would willingly wish himself or his fellow citizens to be subjected to an enquiry in which:

- * A charge, if any, is undefined;
- * Accusers, if any, can never be faced and challenged;
- * Proceedings are in secret and every person testifying is sworn to secrecy, thus allowing shapeless charges by faceless men in the dark;
- * No right of defence or repudiation of untruth or falsehood is thus possible;
- * The Commission alone decides what shall be made public.

The Minister of Justice recently made it clear that the Government is prepared to bend or even break the rule of law when it sees fit. Have we come to this pass that we can no longer be governed save by abominations peculiar to Communistic and totalitarian lands such as state witch-hunts, secret trials, bannings and such allied techniques?

We are in conscience bound to oppose such and other totalitarian methods as a form of evil which is destroying the soul of our people, especially of the Whites.

The situation is made all the more serious because the Government is in this instance being aided and abetted by the official Opposition which is collaborating in this process through its participation in the

TOWARDS EQUALITY IN EDUCATION

Peter Randall

The following address was delivered as the inaugural Helen Suzman Lecture for Equality of Education on 21.6.'73. It has been slightly abbreviated.

There are certain cherished ideals in education, particularly equality of educational opportunity. Implied in this fundamental principle, which surely no ethical person can reject, are such matters as the provision by the state of free and compulsory education for all, greater financial resources for black (i.e. African, Coloured and Indian) education, improved facilities for black education, the elimination of indoctrination in sectional group-loyalty, freedom from coercion in such educational concerns as university admission. These matters provide us with a framework for a discussion of equality in education.

A year ago South African policemen were beating, and politicians were castigating, young South Africans who were protesting, peacefully, against the lack of

c.i. executive (cont.)

Schlebusch Commission, thereby leaving the principles of justice and fairness that are part of the legal and moral fibre of our society to the mercy of politicians.

Believing our stand to be one of conscience and under Divine constraint we re-affirm:

- * We have nothing to hide;
- * We will co-operate fully with an open Judicial Enquiry;
- * There is nothing of significance the Government does not already know about the Christian Institute;
- * If the Government had a legitimate case against the Christian Institute or its staff they would institute court proceedings;
- * Recent arbitrary bannings and punitive actions give us grounds to believe that such investigations are used as the pretext for some non-judicial action.

Freedom is indivisible. What is done to us today may well be done to others tomorrow. Let us be mindful that no man is an island unto himself. Therefore "send not to ask for whom the bell tolls—it tolls for thee".

We call upon all lovers of truth and righteousness to oppose all that which frustrates God's Will within our nation. For righteousness and truth alone exalt a nation.★

educational equality in our country. Sombre warnings of 'student unrest' and 'permissiveness' resounded through the land, with the ubiquitous communist bogey present just around every corner. And so a number of convenient side issues—red herrings in fact—served to obscure the fundamental issue. Instead of a rational debate about the principle of educational equality, we were treated to rantings about dagga smoking in cathedrals and the allegedly unwashed appearance of the dreaded 'demonstrators'.

What we witnessed then was of course a symptom of the growing confrontation and polarisation in our society between those who perceive the urgent need for change and those who are determined to resist change and to maintain the basic features of the present social order at all costs. We are witnessing a clash of values and beliefs, of life styles and of aspirations for our country. The June clashes of last year were only a symptom of the recurring crisis in our society as the forces of change and the forces of reaction meet each other. The immediate response of those with power has been to attempt to suppress the symptoms of change, the symptoms of ferment and renewal, and thus the very symptoms of life itself. Hence the whole rigmarole of government reaction to radical opposition, leading to the Schlebusch Commission and talk of a bipartisan approach to internal security by the two major white political parties. Fundamentally, of course, this is nothing less than a searching after a basic white consensus, a solidifying of the white power group against the increasingly insistent pressures for change.

education is a political matter

Now this has not been merely a digression into the field of politics. You cannot divorce education from the context of our total society and even such a universally accepted principle as equality in education becomes, in South Africa, a profoundly political matter. The inter-relationship between education and politics is not always revealed as vividly as it was last June, and as it is now being revealed in the affairs of the University of the Western Cape, but basically the relationship between politics and education is always there.

In support of this view, let me quote Adam Small, the poet and philosopher and senior lecturer at the University of the Western Cape. He says, "But the truth of the matter is that the unrest at the university is not in the first place concerned with the university as such. It is concerned rather with the total structure of South African society, in fact with the ordering of a society which is very sick and perhaps even rotten to

the core ... a satisfactory resolution would imply the coming about of a truly free and just South Africa" (*Cape Times*, 14/6/73).

So education cannot be seen in isolation from the rest of society, although Colleges of Education may sometimes try to give this impression by acting as if education involves merely a set of theoretical principles, a package deal of neat little methods of teaching, and a smattering of child psychology. For teachers and student teachers, those involved in the shaping of our social order, it seems to me to be vitally important that they keep this relationship between their profession and the broader society constantly in mind. They should never try to evade the profound relationship between education and politics, and the fact that education is indeed ultimately a political matter.

education a tool of white preservation

As one trained in the techniques of teaching (the tricks of the trade as it was described in my own college) I should long ago have defined my terms before using them so freely. Let me attempt to do so now, and in the context which I have been trying to give.

Education is merely one of the great and basic social institutions, along with the economy, the political system, the church, the family. Each society arranges these institutions according to its values, its needs and its aspirations. If the over-riding social concern is for self-preservation, the education will reflect it. If it is militaristic in outlook and concerned with national glorification and expansion, then it will reflect this too, as it did in Nazi Germany. If, on the other hand, the major concern is for the full development of human potential in all its facets, including creativity and non-conformity, and the liberation of the human spirit, then education will likewise reflect these values.

I see education as far more than merely training the young to take their place in the existing social order, and equipping them with the skills necessary for a job. It is, in fact, a life-long process, never completed, and the lessons learnt in the other social institutions, in the home and the workplace, in relationships with other people and in creative pursuits, are ultimately far more important, in truly human terms, than the lessons learnt simply within the formal structures that society provides to socialise its young, the pre-school institutions, the primary school, the secondary school, and the institutions of higher education.

In saying this I do not wish to downgrade or under-emphasise the great importance of these institutions themselves. They, after all, provide the basic skills needed in a technological age, they profoundly influence the value systems of those who pass through them, and they are vital instruments in both the preservation and the renewal of society. In South Africa there seems to be an uneasy tension in the education

system between these functions of renewal and preservation, with the *State increasingly seeking to make education a tool of white preservation*, with its "youth preparedness" programmes, its interest in pistol-shooting for white school girls, and its emphasis on our "national and Christian" norms. At the same time there are those, even within the education system, who challenge these concepts.

Since education reflects the broader society, it is clear that we must expect to find the basic patterns of South African society in our educational system. These patterns embrace enforced racial segregation, discrimination in favour of whites, inequality in the provision of resources and facilities, and inequality of opportunity.

50% African babies die

From the cradle to the grave we have our being in a segregated, discriminatory, unequal and unjust society. More black babies die than white ones. Infant mortality rates are highest for Africans and lowest for whites, with Coloured and Indian in between. It has been authoritatively estimated that nearly fifty percent of all African babies in the homelands die. The state spends approximately twelve times as much on each white school child as it does on each African one. White incomes—now amongst the highest in the world—are about ten times higher, on average, than African incomes. When he has reached his maximum, an African teacher earns less than the starting salary of his white colleague with the same qualifications. So, incidentally, does a Coloured lecturer at the University of the Western Cape: R2 880—R4 080 against R4 200—R5 400 (Rapport 17/6/73). The church erects costly and magnificent buildings for its white members and poor ones for its black members, and, in addition, often pays unequal stipends to its ministers. Income tax bites more deeply into black incomes than into white ones. White trade unions are legally recognised, black ones are not. White pensions are far higher than black ones. One could go on like this, endlessly cataloguing the unequal and unjust features of the apartheid society. Perhaps the most striking indicator of basic inequality is to be found in the life expectancy rates of the different race groups, as revealed by the Minister of Statistics in the House of Assembly last week: White women can expect to live 72,3 years, white men 64,5 years, Asian women 63,9 years, Asian men 59,3 years, Coloured women 56,1 years, and Coloured men 48,8 years. The statistics for Africans were not available (*The Star* 14/6/73). Who can doubt, in the light of the grotesque racial hierarchy in South Africa, that they are the lowest of all?

We have a picture of white comfort, white privilege and white power. The diseases of white people are often those of affluence and over-eating, the diseases of black people are often those of poverty and malnutrition. It is the monopoly of political power in the hands of whites and their disproportionate share of the

country's wealth that has led to this gross imbalance between the racial groups, and makes South Africa a microcosm of the world problem of rich whites and poor blacks.

No one who is concerned about human decency, no one who professes any of the great religious faiths, no one who claims to be concerned about the future of our country, can be complacent or apathetic in the face of this picture of white power and privilege and black poverty and frustration.

guns before schools

The challenge of change is a great and difficult one, and we must recognise that the different facets—education, economics, politics—are closely interlocked. Inadequate education perpetuates poverty because it deprives a man of the training needed for a well-paid job. Poverty perpetuates malnutrition and other social ills, which aggravate an inadequate education, and these things perpetuate black economic powerlessness.

And all these things help to perpetuate black political powerlessness. And since the distribution of the country's resources—for example, the amounts of money to be spent on the education of the different racial groups, or the number of school buildings to be erected—and since the educational policies—for example, the decision that African children should learn three languages in their first year at school, and that the African universities should be sited in remote rural areas—are decided politically, the patterns of discrimination and inequality in our education are politically perpetuated, reinforcing in their turn the other patterns in the broader society.

What more striking example of the importance of political power can there be than the fact that the government plans to spend R470 million for the defence of a social order that breeds resentment and frustration among the bulk of the people? This means that the white parliament has in fact decided—a political decision—to give a higher priority to guns than to schools, since we spend far less of our national wealth than R470m. on education. This means less of the national wealth is made available to educate those whose education is already unequal and inadequate and who have no participation in the political decision-making process.

Where can this vicious cycle be broken, a cycle that causes the state to allocate so much of our resources, earned by the labour of all our citizens, to armies and weaponry? One place is in the formal educational system, in the financing and structuring of schools, colleges and universities for the different race groups. The need for change in this system is urgent, both in moral terms—because we cannot perpetuate inequality and injustice and still claim to be moral people—and in terms of our own self-interest, because we must somehow create a social order that does not need to be protected with guns, if we are to have a future worth

having at all.

education to divide

The need for change in the formal education system has been spelt out often enough, and I need not tire you with a comprehensive list of the specific disadvantages of black education. Some have been indicated already in this talk, and any aware reader of the English press will be conscious of many others. I will, however, try to present a global picture/view, drawing heavily on the report of the Spro-cas Education Commission, *Education beyond Apartheid*, which after two years of study listed seven principles and more than twenty practices in South African education which offend against both Christian ethics and sound educational policy.

There is *the ideological division of education into racial compartments*. One famous educationist has described South Africa as the only country that uses its educational system to divide its people rather than to unite them, and there is much truth in this. For example, the compulsory segregation of English and Afrikaans pupils and the creation of separate ethnic universities must appear to sympathetic outsiders as suicidal in terms of building a loyal and cohesive social order. Instead, it aggravates group loyalty and group hostility.

But racial and ethnic compartmentalisation is such a deeply entrenched article of faith amongst those who at present have the political power to enforce educational policy that there is little we can do except to deplore it and to work for meaningful contacts across the racial barriers.

The policy does, however, provide the government with a convenient formula for perpetuating the basic patterns of discrimination and inequality in the educational system, with the fiction that somehow "Bantu" or "Coloured" education is different from education, that it requires less money, that its teachers can be paid more poorly, and so on.

We cannot even begin to talk about equality of educational opportunity in contemporary South Africa. Coming from already disadvantaged home backgrounds, black children have nothing like the well-developed pre-school system available to whites. They face additional financial burdens compared to whites, since they must pay school levies and purchase most of their text books, if they are fortunate enough to get admitted to a school. Their teachers, who often have to teach double sessions, are generally poorly qualified and poorly paid, and their classes tend to be almost three times as large, on average, as those of whites. No wonder there is a high drop-out rate, with fully 25 per cent of African children leaving school after their first year, and less than one per cent proceeding to the end of the secondary school.

By the end of Std. 11 more than half the African children admitted in Sub-A will have left to join the

street gangs, the newspaper vendors, and the crowds of caddies who on occasion had to be controlled with whips and dogs as they clamoured for work. Their so-called education has been virtually useless, almost a total waste of time and money, since they are not even literate in their own language, their white masters having decided that on top of all their other disadvantages they should start learning English and Afrikaans, as well as their vernacular, from their first year at school. In the words of the Spro-cas Education Commission this would seem to be a linguistic burden unique in this history of education and one motivated by nothing more noble than a self-defeating wish to entrench both the official languages.

It is a sobering thought that even if this picture were to change overnight, even if equality in educational opportunity were to be suddenly accepted, if universal free and compulsory education for all were to be introduced, if the state were to spend an equal amount on every child's schooling, if all teachers were to be paid equal salaries, even if all these things were miraculously to be brought about before the end of 1973, the effects would take a very long time to be felt, and the basic social and economic inequality would continue. If you take a runner who is already handicapped by having only one leg and put him on the same starting line as another who enjoys every advantage, it is hardly realistic to think that it will be a fair race. So what we ultimately may have to think of is an educational system specially weighted in favour of those who have been deprived and handicapped for so long. Headstart projects, selective bursary schemes, and additional financial advantages for black children are devices that may in time have to be implemented.

the danger of charity

That may seem a long way ahead. What can concerned white people do now? Contributing to TEACH, worthy as that cause is, is not a final answer. In fact it carries at least two dangers: first, that it might merely be a conscience-salving gesture for whites who might believe that nothing more is required, and, second, that it might in the long run merely help to perpetuate the dependency of blacks on white charity.

My own belief is that the "satisfactory resolution" spoken of by Mr. Adam Small, which will in fact require a fundamental re-ordering of our society, will ultimately be initiated and brought about by blacks, despite the disadvantages they suffer now.

Once again, however, we cannot simply sit back and leave it to history. Let me suggest a number of fairly random steps that can be taken now by whites in pursuit of the goal of educational equality. I use these merely as examples of the sort of action which I believe can be positive and productive rather than negative and counter-productive in their effects, and I do so in the full knowledge that they may be met more with cynicism than with enthusiasm. For example:

1. Churches, student groups, women's groups and service organisations like Rotary and Lions should assist in establishing pre-school enrichment schemes and headstart projects in black townships.
2. White teachers should actively prepare their pupils for the inevitability of major social change in South Africa, helping them to meet it creatively and courageously.
3. White educators should refuse any further salary increases until parity has been achieved by their black colleagues.
4. Since a major share of the profits of white business comes from black purchasers, white businessmen should allocate a specific percentage of their profits for black education.
5. The churches should deliberately re-allocate their resources, for example by diverting funds from already over-privileged white church schools into black literacy training and the setting up of night-schools and other forms of adult education.
6. Publishers should deliberately cut their profits on text books for black schools, thus making them available more cheaply.
7. White teachers should seek meaningful contact and co-operation with their black colleagues, but not, of course, in a patronising or paternalistic spirit.
8. White staff in the Bantu Education Department, the Department of Coloured Affairs and the Department of Indian Affairs should not accept promotion over the heads of adequately qualified black colleagues.
9. The teachers' societies should establish a reviewing commission to vet all text books for material that offends human relationships.
10. Concerned white students and others should set up an education reform program to pursue specific goals such as the introduction of free and compulsory education for all, the amendment or repeal of legislation that offends against sound educational policy and against generally accepted moral standards, greater financial resources for black education, and equality in educational salaries.

I believe that it is only through active and practical steps like these that we can display any real commitment to the ideals of justice and human liberation. I believe also that actions like these would help to create

Stryd rondom Sydney

J.H. van Wyk

Die besluite, of beter: adviese, van die Gereformeerde Ekumeniese Sinode (GES) van Sydney (1972) oor volkereverhoudinge het nogal opskuddings in Suid-Afrika veroorsaak. Natuurlik ontstaan die vraag: Waarom *nou* eers? aangesien hierdie besluite reeds in 1968 te Lunteren (Holland) geneem is en slegs maar enkele onwesentliche aanvullings te Sydney ondergaan het. Die antwoord is dat enkele kerklike figure hierdie besluite in die pers as uiters verdag begin voorstel het, en die breekpunt is bereik toe die Hervormde Kerk in Mei 1973 hierdie besluite as „onskriftuurlik” en „liberaal” verwerp het. Ons wil graag kortliks aandag gee aan drie Afrikaanse kerkgroepe se siening oor bg. besluite. (2)

Eerstens: Die Hervormde Kerk

Die jongste besluit van die Herv. Kerk oor Sydney is helaas tans nog nie in sy finale vorm beskikbaar nie en daarom is daar 'n gevaar dat hier veralgemeen kan word. Soveel is myns insiens egter duidelik dat ons Hervormde broeders hulle in hul besluit stel op die mees ekstreme vorm van kerklike isolasie wat denkbaar is, dat 'n *eie* kerk vir die swartmense vir hulle neerkom op nog 'n ander (losgemaakte) Herv. Kerk. En dan het die groot woord „liberaal” dan ook gevaar, so nie in die finale besluit nie, dan wel in die voorafgaande en begeleidende diskussie. Liberaal is nou in die oë van (sommige uit) die Herv. Kerk almal wat maar enigszins met Lunteren te doen gehad het: onsersyds ds. A.A. Venter en prof. J.L. Helberg; van die N.G.K. o.m. dr. J.D. Vorster, J.S. Gericke en prof. F.J.M. Potgieter. Liberaal is ook die manne van

TOWARDS EQUALITY IN EDUCATION

a climate in which constructive change can take place, showing blacks, for example, that there *are* whites who are serious about the need for change, and showing other whites that change need not be feared as a traumatic experience. It would be clearly futile to expect the white political system to initiate major changes in the direction of equality in education. But the government will respond to a changed situation, as it has done over the right of black workers to strike. One of the major challenges facing whites in South Africa is whether they can help to create a climate conducive to change sufficiently fast to match the rising tide of black frustration and anger. Teachers clearly have a vital role in educating their pupils in attitudes of tolerance and understanding for the humanity of black people, and for their aspirations and ambitions. If we do not succeed in creating the kind of climate in which the white political system will voluntarily respond to the demands for change, then change will come about forcibly and the vast sums of money spent on armaments may be put to an appalling use. ★

Sydney, van ons kant bv. professore J.L. Helberg, B. Duvenage en T. van der Walt. Is dit egter wáár dat hierdie broeders, wat tog gedeë teoloë is, sommer oornag „liberaal” kan raak? Ons het reeds eerder in *Kerk en Stad* (2) gewaarsku daarteen dat die woord „liberaal” sommer los en vas gebruik word om onkreukbare persone verdag te maak.

Die besluit van die Herv. Kerk het egter 'n agtergrond. Dit hang eerstens saam met hulle *kerkbegrip*, veral soos verwoord in die omstrede art. 3 van hulle Kerkwet. Die *sigbare* organisatoriese eenheid van die kerk is vir ons Herv. broeders volkome onbelangrik en onnodig. Reeds daarom bekommer hulle hul ook nie oor die bestaan van drie Afrikaanse kerkgroepe nie; ook dit is goed en geen sonde nie. 'n Tweede rede vir die jongste besluit is dat 'n aantal teoloë uit hul midde die besluite van Sydney aan 'n ongenaakbare en niksontsienende kritiek onderwerp het. In 'n reeks artikels (3) het prof. A.D. Pont hierdie besluite afgemaak as sou dit die indruk wek „dat ons hier te make het met beginsels en eise van die liberalisme en sosialisme”. (4) Dr. C.J. Mans meen ook dat die Geref. Ekumeniese Sinode t.o.v. volkereverhoudings in dieselfde rigting as die Wêreldraad van Kerke beweeg (5); hoewel hy na 'n reaksie van professore Van der Walt, Duvenage en Helberg (6) asook J.A. Heyns (7) 'n veel meer gematigde standpunt inneem (8). In *Die Hervormer* (9) rig dr. A.J.G. Oosthuizen, jarelange voorsitter van die Kommissie van die Alg. Kerkvergadering, 'n skrywe waarin hy die Herv. Kerk oproep om die voortou te neem om die besluite van Sydney te verwerp. „Ons moet vir ons volk sê dat hierdie besluite soos geformuleer deur die Sinode (te Sydney) aanleiding sal gee dat die liberalistiese en kommunistiese gesinde magte, die kerk sal gebruik om Christus te verloën.”

Ons het egter 'n paar vrae aan die Hervormde broeders. Ten eerste: Waarom reageer u nou eers, en daarby so fel, teen besluite wat alreeds vier jaar oud is? Die besluite van Sydney 1972 is tog wesenlik dieselfde as dié van Lunteren 1968, en het u nie geweet van die Lunteren-besluite nie? Die feit dat die politieke toneel in Suid-Afrika tussen 1968 en 1973 verander het en dat die Herv. Kerk *nou* eers reageer, kan ons nie die gevoel laat onderdruk dat by hulle 1973-besluit méér as net kerklike en teologiese oorweginge 'n rol gespeel het. Ten tweede: Wil die Herv. Kerk nou beweer dat die Here God *net aan hulle* die volle openbaring geskenk het insake vrae rakende die volkereverhoudinge? Is dit nie 'n monopolisering van die waarheid nie? Die meer as 400 miljoen Roomse Christene is hierin op 'n dwaalweg. Goed, dit kan. Die meer as 200 miljoen protestantse Christene dwaal hierin. Dit lyk al meer onwaarskynlik. Die meer as 100 miljoen Grieks-Ortodokse Christene leef ook ten opsigte hiervan in die

duister. Dit laat vrae ontstaan. Maar ook die 5 miljoen Gereformeerde Christene, soos ingeskakel by die G.E.S., dwaal. Net die ongeveer 200 duisend Hervormde Christene in Suid-Afrika het hierin die volle lig ontvang. Kan dit waar wees? Of leer die Bybel ons dat ons „saam met al die heiliges” ten volle begryp wat „die breedte en lengte en diepte en hoogte is, en die liefde van Christus ...” (Efes. 3:18-18). Ten derde: is die kerkbegrip van ons Hervormde broeders skriftuurlik verantwoord? Ek meen dat hulle, met die mistieke eenheidsgedagte, ook hierin alleen staan in die ganse teologiese wêreld.

Tweedens: Die N.G. Kerk en Sydney

Ons het reeds daarop gewys dat die besluite van Sydney 1972 reeds op Lunteren 1968 geneem was. Die 1968-besluite is grotendeels deur die N.G.K. aanvaar(10) en die kerkvolke moet hulle dus nie 'n rat voor die oë laat draai dat „die N.G.K. eers tydens sy Sinode van 1974 daaraan aandag sal gee” nie. Weliswaar is daar veral twee besluite, oor die sg. „gemengde eredienste” en „gemengde huwelike” („gemengd” is nie 'n goeie woord nie), wat voortdurend nog in diskussie is en wat ook onlangs nog deur die Breë Moderatuur van die N.G.K. gekritiseer is. Daar moet egter onthou word dat daar in 1968 'n geweldige debat te Lunteren plaasgevind het toe prof. J. Verkuyl c.s. probeer het om 'n voorstel deur die G.E.S. aanvaar te kry waarin S.A. eksplisiet veroordeel word vanweë ons „rassesituasie”. Die meerderheidsvoorstel, waarin 'n aantal prinsipes neergelê is en geen konkrete veroordeling oor ons uitgespreek is nie, is egter aanvaar, en hierdie beslissing is in S.A. allerweë vertolk as 'n „groot oorwinning” vir S.A. (11) Andere, soos bv. prof. J. Verkuyl, (12) die Christelike Instituut (13) maar ook ons Premier in die Volksraad, 22 April 1969, het dit gesien as 'n verwerping van die Suid-Afrikaanse situasie, m.a.w. as géén „oorwinning” vir S.A. nie, maar wel as 'n „kleiner nederlaag”. Wat die N.G.K. op sy Sinode van 1974 gaan besluit i.v.m. die Sydney-besluite, wat, soos ons gesien het, grotendeels reeds deur die N.G.K. op sy Sinode van 1970 aanvaar is, is moeilik om te sê. Hulle sal egter nou vergader onder die druk en die invloed van die besluit van die Herv. Kerk wat die Sydney-besluite as liberaal verwerp het.

Daar is egter een saak wat ons hier van die hart moet kry, en dit is die skynbaar teenstellende standpunte wat afgevaardigdes, baie afgevaardigdes, inneem wanneer hulle oorsee is en wanneer hulle terug in S.A. is. Mens kry die indruk dat van die broeders-afgevaardigdes oorsee besluite onder druk van buite neem, terwyl hulle in S.A., onder druk van binne, ontken dat hulle vir daardie besluite gestem het. Laat ons 'n voorbeeld noem: dr. J.D. Vorster noem dat hy die besluite van Lunteren „aanneemlik” vind, behalwe vir die twee oor „gemengde eredienste” en „gemengde huwelike” (14) terwyl die voorsitter van die G.E.S., prof. K. Runia, noem dat die besluit is „gemengde eredienste”, „is EENPARIG aangeneem deur al die Geref. Kerke wat aan die Geref. Ekumeniese Sinode behoort”. (15)

Hierdie dubbelslagtigheid het hom ook ná Sydney voorgedoen. Hieraan moet 'n einde kom. Afgevaardigdes moet met die kerkvolk oop kaarte speel. Ons moet nie oorsee ja sê vir sekere sake en tuis nee nie. Laat ons ja ja! en ons nee nee! wees.

Derdens: Die Geref. Kerk en Sydney

Net soos die N.G.K. het ook die Geref. Kerk reeds aandag gegee aan die besluite van die G.E.S. 1968, en wel op sy Nasionale Sinode van 1970, toe byna al die besluite van Lunteren aanvaar is, behalwe vir die twee oor „gemengde” eredienste en huwelike (16) Tydens die Nas. Sinode van 1973 is die besluite van Sydney 1972, wat, soos ons gesien het, wesenlik dieselfde is as Lunteren 1968, selfs wat die numering betref (17) behandel, en nadat die helfte eers (weer) aanvaar is, is besluit om alle punte na deputate te verwys om ons Sinode van 1976 daaromtrent te adviseer. Hierdie deputate het ongetwyfeld 'n moeilike taak in die lig daarvan dat die meeste van die G.E.S.-besluite reeds deur ons Sinode van 1970 aanvaar is, asook in die lig van die omstrede besluit van die Herv. Kerk.

Ruweg gesproke, is daar vir vlakke waarop Christene (en kerke) uit verskillende nasies met mekaar kan kontak maak. Ten eerste op *persoonlike vlak*. Dit kom daagliks voor, in die huis, op straat en in die werk, en dit is vir ons geen probleem nie. Tweedens op die vlak van *huisgesinne*. Dit was (is?) 'n veel voorkomende praktyk gewees, veral op die platteland, dat die huisbediendes saamgeroep word wanneer boekegevat word. Ds. J.J. van der Walt sê hiervan in die katekisasie-handboekie, *Ken en Vertrou* (18): „So is dit vandag nog die korrekte en Christelike reël in baie gelowige gesinne om die bediendes by te roep wanneer die huisgodsdienst gehou word”. Daar is 'n derde vorm van kontak en wel op *sinodale vlak*. Die Geref. Kerk, so sê prof. Hugo du Plessis in sy prikkelende brosjure, *'n Nuwe Deurbraak* (19), aanvaar 'n eie kerk vir die Bantoe maar geen tweede kerk nie. Ons Sinodes van 1955 en 1961 het dan ook besluit dat „die kerkverband verder strek as nasionale grense”. Prakties kom dit daarop neer dat daar nie baie Geref. kerkverbande in S.A. is nie, maar één (gedifferensieerd, maar nie different nie), soos dit tot uitdrukking kom in een *Algemene Sinode*, wat sesjaarliks vergader en wat bestaan uit afgevaardigdes uit die Nasionale Sinodes van die Afrikaners, Kleurlinge en Bantoes—ofskoon daar nog eie gemeentes, hoofsaaklik a.g.v. taalredes, bestaan. Daar is dus nou vyf kerklike vergaderings in die Geref. Kerk in S.A. t.w. die kerkraad, klassis, partikuliere sinode, nasionale sinode en algemene sinode. Die eerste Algemene Sinode het reeds in 1965 te Potchefstroom vergader en die volgende word beplan vir 1975 D.V. Die besluit van die Geref. Kerk om so 'n Algemene Sinode in die lewe te roep en waardeur die organisatoriese kerkeenheid bewaar gebly het—'n gedagte waarvan prof. W.T. Snyman die vader is—sal miskien nog deur die kerkgeskiedenis uitgewys word as die belangrikste en betekenisvolste besluit wat hierdie eeu in die Geref. Kerk geneem is. (20) Die

'Give your heart to Jesus and the world will come right?'

'If everyone was converted to Christ the Kingdom of God would come overnight' is the common cry of those who fear an emphasis on the social aspects of the gospel. 'Get right with God and you will automatically be right with men', they say. 'If your spirit is right you are all right'.

It is not true.

1. Converted people do not automatically become sinless

Though a person comes to believe in Christ, and seeks to follow him, he does not become a sinless servant of the Kingdom overnight but continues to be tempted into known and unknown errors.

Peter believed—yet denied Christ under threat of swords and scorn. Countless Christians made their mark in history by spreading pride, fear, arrogance, schism, contempt, and callous greed. Our own conscience tells us that though we believe we have frequently *not* spread the Gospel.

When we come to Christ we know the forgiveness of sin, and experience an inflow of enlightenment and moral strength to fight sin. But to claim instant sinlessness after that experience and to expect a perfect influence is simply not true. Justification is not sanctification.

N.G.K. het hier 'n *Federale Raad*, wat egter geen kerkvergadering is nie, maar meer 'n kerklike gespreksraad. Die Herv. Kerk het hier niks, want volkskerke beteken vir hulle volkome *geskeie* kerke. Dit is duidelik dat ons die vierde—en mees omstrede—vlak van kontak vir laaste laat bly het: *die gemeentelike*. Nie dāt daar nie oor-en-weer kontak is tussen wit en swart Christene op gemeentelike vlak nie: dit kom wel sporadies voor dat swart lidmate 'n begrafnis of troue bywoon; en omgekeerd is daar heelwat wit lidmate wat swart eredienste besoek, soos o.a. predikante, sendingkomiteede, ouderlinge, ens. Dit is oor hierdie aspek dat die G.E.S. hom sterk (ten gunste daarvan) uitgespreek het en waaroor die besinning tans meer as ooit tevore aan die gang is en wat weer op ons Nasionale Sinode van 1976 ter sprake sal kom.

Ten slotte: Beteken die besluit van die Herv. Kerk 'n breuk tussen die drie Afrikaanse kerkgroepe? Hierdie vraag moet m.i. bevestigend beantwoord word, alle ontkenings daarvan ten spyt. Ek het reeds aangetoon dat sowel die Geref. Kerk as die N.G. Kerk groot dele van die Sydney-besluit *aanvaar* het (via Lunteren), terwyl Sydney juis deur die Herv. Kerk *verwerp* is. As woorde nie hulle betekenis verloor het nie, beteken dit 'n breuk, of ten minste dan 'n *spanningsvolle verhouding*. Tensy ... die ander twee kerkgroepe terugkrabbel of interpretasies gee van Sydney wat daaraan

2. Converted people do not automatically become good citizens of God's Kingdom

They do not know enough. Though their eyes are set on Christ, they are children of their age, subject to all the influences about them, and the battle to see and to follow Christ's way in this world is a long one.

Paul's attitude to women was understandable for his age. It is only as the centuries have unfolded that men have discerned the attitude of Jesus and sought to follow it. The hymn 'How sweet the name of Jesus sounds' was written by Captain John Newton who took shiploads of slaves to America, and who saw no incompatibility between his faith and his deeds, because the implications of the Gospel for society only becomes evident as each age unfolds. As each enlightenment occurs it presents a challenge to the Christians of that period, who must then tackle that call of the Kingdom.

People may claim to be sincere Christians yet treat their families like pawns, give their servants starvation wages, despise 'rocks' or 'rooinekke', discount 'catholic' or 'protestant', and support social attitudes, political beliefs, or economic practices which are the precise obstacles to be overcome by the Kingdom of Christ. None of these attitudes are changed automatically; they have to be worked out and obeyed in

wesensvreemd is. ★

Voetnotas:

- (1) Hierdie besluite het verskyn in *Kerk en Stad*, Okt/Nov. 1968.
- (2) Aug. 1968.
- (3) *Die Afrikaner* 16 Februarie 1973 v.
- (4) Idem, 6.4.73,24
- (5) *Die Transvaler*, 3 Febr. 1973
- (6) Idem 24 Febr. 1973
- (7) Idem, 3 Maart 1973
- (8) Idem 17 Maart 1973
- (9) Maart 1973, 5
- (10) *Acta N.G.K.* 1970, 769
- (11) Vgl. o.a. *Agenda N.G.K.* 1970, 52-53; W.B. de Villiers, *Lunteren en die Rassekwessie*, Braamfontein 1969, 93-95; ds. A.J.V. Burger in *Die Transvaler*, 4 Apr. 1970
- (12) *Gereformeerde Weekblad*, 2.5.1969, 301
- (13) *Pro Veritate*, 15.9.1969, 5
- (14) *Die Kerkbode*, 16.10.1968, 503,
- (15) *Woord en Daad*, Febr. 1970, 11
- (16) *Acta Geref. Kerk* 1970, 62-67
- (17) *Acta RES.* 1968, 339-341; *Acto RES* 1972, 328-330
- (18) Braamfontein 1968, 136
- (19) *Potchefstroom* 1963, 32
- (20) *Acta Geref. Kerk* 1961, 118-119, 186, 233; *Acta* 1964, 267, 269.

Hierdie artikel het in „*Kerk en Stad*“, in die maandblad van die Gereformeerde Gemeente Johannesburg-Sentraal verskyn. Ds. J.H. van Wyk, die leraar van die gemeente, het dit geskryf en goedgunstiglik toestemming verleen dat dit in *Pro Veritate* opgeneem kan word.

terms of Christian belief and the task demands precise and persevering discipleship. Such profound changes in society are promised by the Kingdom of God that Jesus said it was like starting life all over again to see it (John 3:3).

People who make the statement above this article are invariably saying 'No' to God as He calls them to follow Him in a social, political, or economic sphere. It is much easier to ask others to give their souls to Christ, than it is to win a nation to Christ, but the latter is the disciples' commission (Matt. 28:19).

"How to get God's order on Earth—that is the problem" wrote Dr. Sangster. "Some people haven't even seen it yet."

3. **Converted people are not the only folk God uses**

Many people in churches have the colossal cheek to assume that God only works through them, and that His activity in the world is measured by the growth of religious systems, or of personal discipleship. To claim the sole hot line to God is no doubt good tactics for a shameless charlatan seeking to command the credulity of superstitious supporters, but it is quite false.

God works with 'unbelievers' as well as 'believers'. He is the God of all the earth, not just the God of the Christians, or the God of religious people, and He works through all men and for all men, whatever they believe about him.

Thus social change is not only the result of personal change. God is at work in the whole of humanity, creating pressures, making openings, revealing needs, indicating responses, striving, suffering, winning with men.

It was God who decided when the time was right to make the move against slavery, and stirred men throughout the world until the evil was overcome. God roused men to a concern for the emancipation of women and children, to eradicate sweated labour, banish ignorance and disease, and develop the resources which will enable and pay for his Kingdom.

The difference between the Christians and the non-Christians is not that God works through the former and not the latter; it is that Christians know God is working in the world and the others do not know it.

The task of the churches is not to decide what must be done for God in the world, but to perceive and proclaim what God is doing. It is to call men from their ways to God's way on earth. It is to let men see the way of salvation and walk in it.

4. **God works in the world**

When someone comes to believe in the living God whom we know through Jesus, he is released into a world full of new meaning. What is God doing in the world, and where is He calling?

What is He saying in the racial conflict, in black consciousness, in white politics? What is God saying in the ecumenical movement and the pentecostal groups?



Rev. Cedric Mayson is the minister of the Witbank Methodist Church.

~~~~~  
What does God say on want and wealth, in the spread of socialism and communism, in the "new morality", in sport?

The God we have tried to confine to the churches and our particular type of believer is out there in the world, busy on these things, calling those who believe in Him to find and follow what He believes in.

We must correct our theological geography. God is not up in heaven, sending church members out into the world to bring people into the churches and save souls for heaven. He is the God of earth, and He lives in it.

God calls us from the heart of the world where He is hungry, naked, homeless, lonely, oppressed, ignorant (Matt. 25:45). God calls us from the heart of the world where He is seeking to announce good news to the poor, proclaim release for captives, recover the sight of the blind, free the downtrodden, and proclaim the Lord's favour (Luke 4:18). Earth, not heaven, is the scene of His endeavour.

We must re-examine our theological history. It is God's purpose to bring His earth to fruition and fulfilment, and it is this purpose which holds history together from the development of cavemen and early tribalism to today's search for an international community. God is not only concerned for the history of the Jews and of the church, but with the whole world which He designed, destined for His rule, and to whose success He is devoted.

We must re-align the place of religion in our theological understanding. God is spirit but the attempt to limit His concern to the religious is ridiculous. The religious element in the New Testament takes its place alongside the economic and social, the agricultural, political and technical aspects. *Christianity is a way of life, not a religious system.*

Have you let an obsession with 'accepting Christ as your personal Saviour' become a means whereby you have rejected Him as your Lord? Or, like the early Christians, have you accepted that 'Jesus Christ is Lord', and found this faith the doorway to a new vision of life altogether? ★

## **“GOVERNMENTAL VIOLENCE” OR “GOVERNMENTAL RETALIATION”?**

Dear Sir,

Your editorial of March 1973 refers.

This is headed “Governmental Violence and Christian Witness”, in reality it should read “Christian Violence and Governmental Retaliation”. It is full of the superficial cliches and intellectualisms of the Christian totalitarianism which poses Christ as an externalised “big-brother” instead of man’s indwelling source of strength.

You are looking at a local situation with a parochial mind, instead of seeing the total world situation in which a powerful so-called “Christian” Church (which is just as totalitarian as Communism—the only difference is that it worships “charisma”, or personality, whereas communism worships the social machine, a state) is persecuting (yes, it is in one of its inquisitorial phases) a small nation which valiantly refuses to sacrifice its national identity to the juggernaut “identity in Christ”—which is obviously totalitarian, because “totalitarian” means, by definition, the total rejection of any other form of identity or ideology. God does not work in this way; he does not chop and change from one ideology to another. He keeps adding one more revelation to what went before, and so becomes more revealed the more experience we have of him. The noblest of animals looks vicious when brought to bay.

Polarisation between peoples is not created by the superficial action of governments; it arises from different experiences of God, and different abilities to respond to his demands. Faith is the supreme value in any society, and it does not mean blind belief in the absurd, but rather steadfastness and reliability in upholding the covenants made between ourselves and God and our fellow-covenanters in matters of vital importance of life and death—not just silly idealistic dreams.

I challenge you to publish this letter and your reply to it.

**A.R. Stephenson**



### **THE HIGHEST NORM IS CHRISTIAN LOVE**

*If I understood our correspondent correctly he makes the point that the editorial was too narrow in its vision in its evaluation of “governmental violence” and*

*where the government replaced “democracy by totalitarianism”. The key reason for this, he argues, is that the Christian Church in the world persecutes “a small nation (whites? Afrikaners?) which valiantly refuses to sacrifice its national identity to the juggernaut “identity in Christ”. According to this reasoning it is therefore justified for the government to use such ruthless methods to uphold the “national identity” of “a small nation”.*

*The answer to that must surely be that one cannot have anything against a person’s identity but—and that is what our correspondent and most whites fail to see—this identity can never be maintained at the expense of the total erosion of the basic rights of other people, the majority in South Africa, which causes them terrible suffering.*

*However, it does not end there. This “maintenance of identity” also means the usurped right of the white people to make total life decisions on behalf of the Black, Coloured and Indian people in South Africa. Surely it cannot be a Christian way of life if the “maintenance of identity” is being done in such a way that it dehumanizes and causes suffering on people all around us.*

*I agree that God does not “change from one ideology to another”—to say the truth, God’s word to the world is not an ideology, but the gospel of Christ which transcends all ideologies and systems. Therefore, one cannot compare “identity in Christ” and “identity”/“ideology” as rivalries as our correspondent does when he alleges that the world’s Christian Church “persecutes a small nation” with “identity in Christ” over and against the nation’s apartheid ideology. This means that where a man’s, or a nation’s ideology or mythologized policy clashes with the gospel of Christ, as apartheid does, it must be changed. Otherwise that ideology becomes the highest value and then a “nation’s identity” becomes “god”, an idol in God’s place.*

*Our correspondent also exempts the government from creating “polarisation between peoples”. But the government, and the majority of the white electorate who supports it cause resentment, hatred, frustration and polarisation because it is becoming more and more totalitarian, i.e. it “arrogates to itself all rights including those normally belonging to individuals”.*

*I agree that we must uphold the covenants made between ourselves and God and our fellow-covenanters. But if we are Christians the basic content of our covenant is supreme loyalty to God’s will and not to our “identity”, and also love for our (black) brothers and sisters. Christ taught the contents of that love when He served till the death on the cross. If we do not love our (black) brothers and sisters, we lie if we say we love God (1 John. 4:20).*

**-Editor**

# **Capitalism, Socialism and Apartheid**

Dear Sir,

In your February 1973 issue there appeared a letter signed J. Zimmer. The author claims, inter alia, that "our much-praised system of free enterprise, alias capitalism, has inhumanity and injustice built into it and is a part of the apartheid problem", and proceeds to advocate socialism (sic!) as the ideal solution.

J. Zimmer's gross misrepresentation of the capitalist ideology is most unfair and unenlightened. Moreover, the author demonstrates a regrettable lack of historical knowledge; with regard to the history of the capitalist and socialist ideologies as well as with regard to the peculiar history of the South African society.

From my own experience (I am a political scientist who have lived in South Africa doing research work on the particular issue in question), I must strongly reject the distorted image of reality perceived and propounded by J. Zimmer.

The cardinal element of capitalism is the concept of Man as a free being, with unalienable and individual rights of life, liberty and pursuit of happiness. It should be needless to say that this concept is incompatible with the collectivist ideology of apartheid, which holds that man should not be treated on basis of individual merits, but according to his origin or the colour of his skin. This collectivist (and authoritarian) approach is what characterizes both apartheid and socialism (as well as the related ideologies of communism, fascism and nazism). Therefore, one should hardly be surprised when reading the statements by General Hertzog, D.F. Malan and B.J. Vorster, which *Geoff Budlender* quotes in his commendable article "Civil Rights and the University" (printed in *Pro Veritate*, April 1973, pp. 20-22).

For a well-documented and thoroughly enlightened analysis of the real nature of apartheid as diametrically opposed to capitalism (but closely related to socialism), I will whole-heartedly recommend J. Zimmer (and others interested in this subject) to read Professor W.H. Hutt's book *The Economics of the Colour Bar* (London, 1964).

**Gunnar Skagestad**



## **Common Worship**

Dear Sir,

Chapter II of the Acts of the Apostles tells of the launching of the Christian faith in the streets of Jerusalem and the first act of public worship by the apostles and the multitudes, a feast celebrated by all Christianity about this time.

"And suddenly there came a mighty wind from

heaven ... and there appeared tongues as it were of fire and it sat upon every one of them and they were all filled with the Holy Spirit."

Then it describes the multitudes that gathered together. There were 16 different peoples as well as the Jews and after listening to the preaching of the apostles, "There were added in that day about 3 000 souls and they were persevering in the doctrine of the apostles, and in the communication of the breaking of the bread and in prayers."

There is great significance in the bold statement "3 000 souls" and in the phrase "the COMMUNICATION of the breaking of the bread". Both show the togetherness, the non-grouping and/or non-division of the people, their act of worshipping as a whole, a worshipping in common, in other words "common worship".

This was the work of the Holy Spirit Himself, the Paraclete, whose promised coming the apostles had been told to await.

But the D.R.C. has a different meaning for "common worship". For them it does not mean worship in common but worship in division, in different places governed by race.

Putting aside the dialectics of Dr. Gericke his colleagues and others in sympathy with them, where do they get the authority for this division of the worshippers of God?

Where do they find an authority in the bible higher than the Holy Spirit to which they can refer?

Or are they one in spirit with the dear old lady, vehement in her condemnation of the intrinsic evil of wine, who when asked what then did she think of the miracle of the changing of the water into wine, gave the delicious reply "Oh that is the only part of the bible I don't approve of"?

**Denise Goodwin**



## **A TASK FOR WOMEN**

Dear Sir,

I was glad to read the letter from Denise Goodwin under the heading "Man's world—A Failure?". The need for the advancement of women has to be kept constantly before "the Man's World". I do not believe that any nation is worthless, but the individuals of a nation are people capable of great heroism and love. Cannot women do something to control the population explosion, since this is very much within the sphere of women?

Woman can well expend her intellect, and her gifts, on controlling the flood of babies which threatens the world, as did the deluge of water in (as we say) Biblical times. When men try to solve this problem they are likely to use the methods they understand—war and massacre.

**J.P. Rees**



**CHURCH BRINGS CHANGE?**

The first six resolutions I previously discussed have pointed out the crucial difficulty which the racial problem creates for Christianity in South Africa. The Christian religion predicates a universal order in which men should live together as sons of a common Father, without distinctions or discriminations based on colour or culture.

Yet despite the church's aim and effort racial hatred or, more accurately, racial discrimination has invaded every aspect of our national living and has embedded itself even in the church of God. It has split our religion into the unnatural segments of black and white. It violates our sense of Christian brotherhood and vitiates the power of the Gospel that we preach. By warping our judgement and blinding our vision it makes clear thought difficult and honest action dangerous. It raises the severest challenge to the church and it weakens the capacity of the church to fight back. Racial discrimination in South Africa stands today as the Christian's vicious dilemma.

I believe that conquering this racial hatred, or whatever you may decide to call it, is a *must* from which there is no evasion, no escape, if Christianity is to survive in our country. We must conquer it firstly for the salvation of our own souls. We know now, as we have already pointed out, that we cannot simultaneously love God and hate a brother. This is strong language, but it is clear. The church in our country is forced to face the challenge of "racism" and must overcome it as quickly as possible. I sincerely believe that the conquest of this evil is the high vocation for which the Christian in South Africa has been set apart.

The question now before us is, how can the problem be met and mastered? What part must the church play?

**Resolution No. 7**

"Believers should be equipped by the church through teaching and discipline to serve God, in all spheres of society, individually, and where possible, corporately. Believers must also proclaim the commandments of love in race relations and make it applicable to the affairs of civil government and the structures of society."

It is the contention of this seventh resolution that the church as an institution and as a group of individual Christians can do as much as and probably more than any single agency in the nation to meet the problem of racial discrimination on Christian grounds and to root it out of our national order.

**Abnormal fear creates tension**

Racial prejudice in South Africa is based upon suspicion, fear, misunderstanding and antagonism,

most of which are groundless but which persist just the same. The popular mind in South Africa needs direction here. Not only are our minds confined by the frictions that arise during the ordinary contact of diverse human groups, but we are also afflicted by the professional hatemongers, the leaders of racist movements who gain prominence and power by means of the dissemination of distorted ideas; men who deliberately appeal to every capacity for hatred within the human mind. These two forces—ordinary antagonism and abnormally aroused fear—keep the popular mind in a constant state of confusion and excitement giving rise to acts of meanness and oppression we normally would be ashamed of.

The church can bring to light the unreasonableness of these popular beliefs through teaching and discipline. It can show that black people are no worse and no better than any other element of the national population. It can show that the black man has played as vital a part in the nation's economic and cultural development as any other element. It can show that, given the opportunity, blacks do as well as anyone else. It can show that giving a black man a decent job does not injure the social structure, neither does it presage black domination. It merely means a higher standard of living for one citizen and thus a contribution to the total economic advancement. As each citizen advances, the whole society does too. The church can help by showing that blacks do not want to dominate the nation. They want only to be good citizens with all the rights and responsibilities that good citizenship entails.

I believe that many Christians, even within the Dutch Reformed Church, today recognise this, but the truth has been so widely distorted by professional haters and by a heritage of distorted beliefs that it needs constant reiteration.

Let me point out in closing that the role of the individual Christian is important. Action by the church is significant, but vigorously active individuals are important too. I strongly believe that the individual Christian, in his daily walks and talks, can wield a revolutionary influence upon our pattern of life. If tomorrow millions of white church members should begin to act personally towards black men and women as if they were men and women (which they are of course), not black men and women, the faces of the black people and of our country would light up as if a new sun had appeared in the heavens. If to any one the great changes in race relations do not now seem possible then let him set about practising the humbler virtues of courtesy and righteousness in personal relations. That is part of the miracle-working power we

# ~~~~~ A Confessing Church in S.A.? ~~~~~

Ross Snyder

The Republic of South Africa, which never lacks tension-filled events, may be witnessing the birth of a "confessing church". For the first time, an organised body of Christians has taken a public stand that brings it into direct conflict with the laws of the land.

Last year a parliamentary select committee was set up to investigate the activities of four anti-apartheid organisations—the Christian Institute of Southern Africa, the National Union of South African Students (NUSAS), the South African Institute of Race Relations, the University Christian Movement. The committee was later made a commission of inquiry (it is known as the Schlebusch Commission) so that it could continue to operate while parliament was not in session. The commission, which holds its deliberations in secret, has power to subpoena witnesses. Its members are drawn from the parliament—six Nationalists and four United party members, none of whom has judicial qualifications.

The Schlebusch Commission's first report concerned NUSAS, and in February the government ordered eight leaders of that organisation banned, invoking a form of punishment some refer to as "civil death". The student leaders have no recourse to any court of law, no appeal is permitted, and in fact they were not even told why they have been banned. For five years, these eight leaders are to be confined to a magisterial district. They are not permitted to communicate with each other or with any other banned person, or to teach at or attend an educational institution. They may not be quoted in the press. They may not attend any gatherings (the term is defined as a group of three or more people), enter a factory or court of law, or prepare or collaborate on any writing intended for publication.

The banning procedures were established under the Suppression of Communism Act, a measure which in effect allows the government to take action against

## CHURCH BRINGS CHANGE

seek. Whoever follows such a course can do so with the satisfaction that if it does not bring immediately the national salvation he seeks, it will have the virtue of helping to save his own soul.

Let us Christians in this country remember that we are at war with vicious unchristian forces. And for us there can be no retreat. If antichrist wins, the church dies. We cannot be a sheltered, retired group, chanting and singing on corners in a country run by the devil.

Our way of life must be the dominant way here in South Africa, or our way will go. Thank you, God, for I know that the way of Christ will win! ★

anyone considered a threat to the status quo. No proof of any link with communism is required. In regard to the bannings of the eight students, one commission member noted that "nowhere could the commission find that these activists, who are abusing the organisation of NUSAS, had been motivated by any intention to further the ends of communism".

## A Stand for Christian Justice

It is this kind of arbitrary action that many feared when the select committee was first convened. It has now become clear that the Schlebusch Commission of Inquiry is a mechanism designed to deal with the four anti-apartheid organisations in a manner that will provide a superficial facade of democratic procedure. But one of the four has determined to shatter that facade by resisting the process. Its response was reported on March 11 in the pages of South Africa's major daily newspapers:

Members of the Board of Management and executive staff of the Christian Institute—the next organisation to be investigated by the Schlebusch Commission—will refuse, at the risk of heavy fines or jail sentences, to give evidence before the Commission or to co-operate in its inquiry in any way.

Their stand is fully backed by the board of the Institute. The board has passed a resolution affirming its support for those of the board and staff executive "who decide that in conscience they cannot co-operate with a Commission of Inquiry which they consider, by its constitution and mandate, to be a denial of the democratic process and judicial procedure."

There have been other bannings and other protests. Most of the major Protestant churches have issued statements condemning the arbitrary nature of banning. The Christian Institute's action, however, marks the first time that a responsible body of Christians has made public its decision not to conform to the laws of the country. *These Christians thus affirm that lawfulness is not the ultimate criterion for morality, that in fact a law may be immoral.*

This, then, is a prophetic stance the Christian Institute has taken in open confrontation with the government and at real cost both to individuals and to the organisation. In recent years South Africa's citizens have become accustomed to student protests. Now they are faced with a group of prominent churchmen,

many of whom hold high positions in their churches, openly defying the law. Students were easily shrugged off as irresponsible, rebellious and immature; the question of certain laws' morality could thus be ignored. But with the stand taken by the Christian Institute, white South Africans are thrown into a deep dilemma. The suspicion that laws made by a totalitarian, oppressive government cannot be defended, weighs against the realisation that to acknowledge the injustice is to bring oneself into direct conflict with a government that does not hesitate to act against those who thwart its desires.

The Christian Institute's decision represents the birth of what might be called a "confessing church" in South Africa—a body of Christians who confess the lordship of God over the allegiance that an authoritarian government claims. To the white people of South Africa, who live in a land they like to refer to as "Christian", this is a new and startling development.

### BLACK POWER AND FEAR

What are the implications for the future? With all the undercurrents in South Africa, it is hard to predict. Yet certain things are clear. The Christian Institute's stand marks a second significant trend. The first was the development of "black consciousness", a three-year-old movement which is rapidly becoming one of the most powerful forces for change in South Africa. The phenomenon is clearly much more than political; it represents a culture rediscovering itself and beginning to assert itself. Thus it reaches beyond the influence of the African political movements of the '50s which the government effectively crushed. It reaches beyond the aims of politically aware and articulate blacks toward the very heart and dignity of black culture. Its latent power is tremendous and probably cannot be crushed, though its growth might be slowed.

The response to the rise of black consciousness and to the anti-apartheid protests of whites seems to be harsher and more repressive action by the government. The key to the puzzle is fear. It is fear that causes whites to resort to the oppressive maintenance of white superiority over the black peoples. It is fear that causes a great many whites tacitly to support a system of oppression that they openly concede is not just. Through the exploitation of these fears, the government maintains its power. Through the fear of punitive action, the government attempts to prevent any kind of effective action in opposition to its policies. By means of a massive network of informers and security agents, the government is able to intimidate and frighten those who would oppose it.

If we are to look to future creative co-operation between all peoples of South Africa, then fear must be dealt with and eradicated. The Christian Institute is facing up to fear and finding a new power and relevance in overcoming it. There is a prophetic message here for all South African whites. If the white South African's total response to black consciousness is to be

one of intolerance and suppression engendered by fear, then it is hard to visualize a peaceful co-existence for the future. It is imperative that whites understand black consciousness as potentially constructive rather than destructive, for it seems highly likely that their understanding will determine which potential will be fulfilled. The Christian Institute's stand could lead to a growing awareness among whites that their future lies not with the unjust system and its accompanying laws, but with the full acceptance of black initiative and participation in all of South African life.

The birth of a "confessing church" in South Africa brings with its prophetic challenge the promise of hope and possibility. It needs all the support it can get.★

*This article appeared in "The Christian Century", 18.4.73.*

## ADMINISTRATOR

**Wilgespruit Fellowship Centre wants to make a senior appointment.**

The goal of the Centre is to promote ecumenical Christianity and we are looking for someone with organising ability, concern for ecumenism and for people.

The task of Administrator involves office and financial administration, the supervision of the Conference Centre, performing personnel functions and maintaining relationships with committees and other organisations. Please write before August 27, 1973, and indicate your background, qualifications, why you are interested and when you can commence work. The conditions of service and salary scales are available on request.

Write to: The Warden,  
P.O. Box 81,  
Roodepoort,  
Transvaal.

## MANUSCRIPTS WANTED

Consortium Press of Washington DC is actively seeking book-length manuscripts treating social psychological and historical aspects of religion and theology, in a popular and non-technical vein.

Consortium Press has published a considerable number of theological writings including the famous "Fathers of the Church" series, "Studies in Christian Antiquity", the "Cistercian Fathers" series, and recently, Thomas O'Brien Hanley's popular book "The American Revolution and Religion".

Authors are invited to submit their manuscripts to:

Dr. Daniel F. Mc Grath,  
Publisher,  
Consortium Press,  
821 Fifteenth Street NW,  
Washington, DC 20005.

# THEOLOGY AND SENSITIVITY TRAINING

Brian Johanson

An edited version of what Prof. Johanson said to the S.A.C.C. Commission investigating Wilgespruit. He teaches theology at the University of S.A.

While this is an attempt to formulate a Christian attitude towards, and a theological assessment of, sensitivity training, I am nevertheless thinking in more general terms of group activities within the Christian community. I will be addressing myself to principles rather than practice.

What I have to say is in the setting of what might be called thoroughly orthodox Christian theology.

## a basic view of man

The point of departure for our consideration of this question can helpfully be the *Christian understanding of man*. Our first observation is in the nature of a paradox: Man cannot be known from merely human phenomena, for if we try to create an ideal man out of that which we have observed amongst men, we are likely to end up with an illusory figure; on the other hand if we try to discover what man is by simply looking at men as we know them, we find ourselves with a rather dubious, curious mixture. Jesus Christ is the true man at the centre of our faith and he reflects to us what humanity is. In Jesus Christ we discover that primarily man is man for God, and man for his fellows. There is a great deal more to be said than that, but that Jesus Christ shows us man in the setting of relationships with God and man is fundamental, and on this basis we can say that man is man in a context of relationships. It has been well said that "you cannot be human on your own".

If the structure of our humanity is such that we are only human in the context of relationships with people and with God, then this has something to say about the *Christian doctrine of sin* as well. Sin has often been construed in moralistic terms, concerning what may or may not be done; it is an infringement of rules and regulations. This is an inadequate concept, and it should rather be seen as that which disrupts relationships, breaks human persons and ignores responsibilities in human relationships. It is not without significance that in the Genesis saga, the first question addressed to man by God is "Adam where are you?"—'where are you in relationship to me?'; and the second question which follows very shortly in the second chapter, addressed to Cain, is "Where is your brother?"—that is, 'where are you in relation to your fellow man?' Sin then would be that which breaks relationships between man and God.

The third issue that arises concerns the *nature of salvation*. In this context the Christian doctrine of

salvation will mean a restoration of relationships, the reconciliation of men who are estranged from God and from each other. Once again this can only be understood in terms of Christ whose life and death is devoted to the achievement of this goal. The work of Christ is directed towards the wholeness of man as this is discovered in integrated relationships.

The fourth doctrine that arises concerns that *fellowship* that emerges amongst reconciled people, or those people who have been caught up in God's salvation, that is the doctrine of the church. The church is the community of persons bound together in love and reconciliation through Christ. There is a lot more to be said about the church than that but it is this essential character of the church which has tended to be rather superficial.

We, as the established church, have tended to make rather a *patchwork operation of human relations*. Forgiveness, for example, has been treated as a kind of a theological thing that is accepted as a declaration from the priest concerning a person's relationship towards God. Restitution and compensation, where these are called for, have been rather coldly calculated in legalistic or even financial terms. Relationships within the church tend to be constructed on the basis of a rational consensus; that is, because we believe the same thing we therefore belong together; or on the basis of sentimental talk of love that declares that we must love one another. In other words, the church has tended to be a social gathering which has not faced the necessity of confrontation as the prerequisite of reconciliation. There has been as a result, the loss of a redemptive fellowship within the church. The true nature of the church on the contrary is such as to provide fellowship and contact across all historically developed barriers of class and colour and denomination.

## encounter between persons

These then are the four doctrines which lie behind what follows. In focussing on the concept of the church as a community of persons, I wish to suggest that the form of the encounter that takes place between persons is very simply defined, in terms of four human functions which call for great sensitivity.

*First* of all, and it might seem absurdly simplistic to put it in this way, but the first form of the human encounter is *seeing one another eye to eye*. We often look 'past' one another or 'through' one another, in which case of course, we do not form a human encounter.

The *second* element in human encounter is *hearing one another*. We frequently do not hear each other,

hearing only what we select to hear. Or else we listen without listening, thinking only of what we are going to say next. Again the way in which we listen is frequently a denial of true human encounter.

The *third* form of human encounter is in speaking. *Speaking* is not merely saying words, it is sharing the innermost part of our being with the person whom we are addressing. Speech is, after all, not a third element that passes between two persons; it is the unveiling, the exposure of the innermost part of our being. We often use speech to conceal ourselves, and that too is a denial of Christian encounter.

The *fourth* element in the human encounter is that we do all these things, seeing one another, hearing one another, addressing one another with a view to *helping one another*. All of this must take place under the token of gladness. Any one of these aspects of the human encounter which takes place grudgingly or morbidly or crossly, immediately denies the structure of that relationship.

Now this might seem all rather strange as a theological statement, but I hope you will accept it as part and parcel of the Christian doctrine of man in encounter; in a saving, healing, reconciling encounter.

#### **group inter-action**

People have always inter-acted in groups. This is not a modern phenomenon: one thinks of the "schools of the prophets" in the Old Testament; of the twelve men that Jesus gathered around himself. Here was a group that inter-acted in both sensitive and insensitive ways during the course of the years that they worked together. Jumping the centuries, one thinks of Wesley's classes and then in more recent time, the Oxford group, and so on. We could go on elaborating many such groups that have been formed, but the principle of group inter-action has been rediscovered in the past 20 to 25 years. There are many pastoral psychologists who have done a lot of work in this field. Robert Leslie for example. His recent book *Sharing Groups in Churches* reflects his experience of twenty years in which he has seen sensitivity groups working effectively for the healing of persons. Howard Clinebell of Claremont, California, has also written on his experiences in this connection. Robert Lambourne, the British doctor/medical-man-cum-theologian, wrote an excellent book, *Community Church and Healing*. I mention these to underline the fact that these pastoral psychologists have all found that the agony of loneliness, of fragmentation, of isolation, has not been met by the conventional social church structures. People are often left with the question of where to go for help, and it has been found that bringing people into groups has been a way in which they have been able to help one another often more dramatically than in psychiatric and formal relationships with professionals. This is not an exclusive statement but is a complementary statement.

Of course there are limitations to group activities.

Paul Pruyser, eminent psychologist of religion in America, in his *Dynamic Psychology of Religion*, points to these dangers, or limitations, and warns against the equation of a group experience with the totality of Christian experience as though this were the be-all and end-all of Christian living. There are also other dangers, and probably no one has unveiled them as ruthlessly as William Sargent in his *Battle for the Mind*.

In attempting some kind of evaluation of interaction within a group situation, and the dangers which attend it, we should remember that even though preaching can be manipulative and authoritative we do not therefore abandon preaching; even though pastoral advice and pastoral counselling can be dictatorial and domineering we do not therefore abandon pastoral care; even though worship can be sentimental and artificially soothing we do not abandon worship; even though hymn singing can be emotional and trite we do not abandon singing our praises to God; even though praying may be a mere process of auto-suggestion we do not therefore advocate the abandonment of prayer.

Therefore even though group dynamics, group relationships may be manipulative and even destructive, this is no reason for repudiating their usefulness.

#### **disturbing experiences**

Sensitivity training has been criticised because of the very disturbing experiences that some people undergo. Reading in the Schlebusch Commission report, it is stated that a bishop described his experience in a certain session as "traumatic". They picked that word up and played around with it considerably, until eventually he indicated that he did not mean traumatic in a psychological or technical sense but only as a very disturbing but ultimately wholesome experience. This is therefore not necessarily a negative criticism, for a disturbing experience can be both good and bad; it can be both necessary and unnecessary: The process of self-discovery can be a painful but necessary and even valuable experience, and it often happens only when people reflect back to us something of what we are.

One thinks for example of the basic conversion experience which people sometimes undergo when coming into the Christian faith. For many a man this has been a disturbing experience. The Bible reminds us that "faithful are the wounds of a friend". Therefore the fact that these group experiences may be disturbing and even traumatic is no grounds for repudiating them.

Group interaction can be valuable to the degree that such an experience contributes to a clearer self-perception, enabling a person to discover his own potential and his capacities to help other people to discover their own potential. Self-perception is an immensely important experience. There has been a tendency to gloss over this in the life of the church.

Group interaction can also be valuable and good to the degree that it contributes to a greater awareness of

## *In Spite Of All*

If you were blind  
And could not see my face,  
And deaf to sound so  
    could not hear my voice,  
And if I took your hand  
And touched your cheek  
And led you gently,  
Walking by your side —  
Would you accept from me  
    the gift I long to give,  
The sharing of a life  
    we both must live?  
And would you know  
    that, though  
The Law must be obeyed,  
I would be there beside you  
    to the end —  
And call you still  
    “My Friend”?

*Naomi R. Pucher*

## *The Limits of Permissiveness*

Within the sacred precincts  
    of my office  
I may not sit with him  
    Tho' he superior be  
    In all the attributes  
    of value or importance.  
So gentle in his manner, kind,  
And treating me with deference,  
    Respect, affection,  
Yet - he may not sit with me!

We live and move and have our  
    being here,  
“OUR Father” - and not “Mine” -  
    Is still our prayer,  
And, in a common death  
    Upon the road,  
    Or maybe in the air  
    Together innocently -  
    May we share?

Or will OUR Father draw ME in,  
    And leave HIM there?

*Naomi R. Pucher*

---

## *Sensitivity Training (cont.)*

how other people feel.

It can be good and valuable also to the degree that it contributes to a resolving of problems between people through the understanding of the principles upon which human relationships function. It can be good and valuable to the extent that it discovers true wholeness of life in experiencing the presence of Jesus Christ in His Love and Wholeness. It can be good and valuable finally to the degree that it recreates that redemptive fellowship to which I referred earlier, which is the essential character of Christian community.

### **no brainwashing at wilgespruit**

In other words, group interaction can make a valuable contribution to the rediscovery of true humanity, as this is reflected in the Christian understanding of man outlined earlier in this discussion. I am not in a position to evaluate Wilgespruit, or what went on there, never having attended any courses there. Whether what went on there was manipulative, whether it was brainwashing, whether there were excesses engaged in, is not for me to say. What is quite clear is that the elements of brainwashing were totally absent, and there is no indication that such procedures

took place. After all, brainwashing involves the total breakdown of the individual—it involves physical exhaustion, it involves a resulting mental disturbance, and it involves a totally destroyed ego. In this condition ideas which are fed into that mind are simply accepted and then repeated back again. These elements are not even evident in the Schlebusch Commission's description of what went on at Wilgespruit.

What would appear to me to have been of immense value is the fact that in these groups a context has been provided for people of all races, denominations, and even religions, truly to encounter each other.

Finally I would say that in all encounter groups that go under the name of Christian, responsible Christian leadership is obviously a prerequisite for there to be healthy and meaningful programmes. We know that the leadership in these groups must be very judicious; it must not be dominating, it must not be domineering. But it must, in a measure at least, be controlling under the guidance of the Spirit of Christ. Under these conditions sensitivity training can promote genuine growth in character and personality, because, directly or indirectly, it rests on the valid criteria by which humanity must be defined. ★

# WEIGHED AND...? GEWEEG EN...?

*This column in English and Afrikaans comprises short extracts from reports on news, views, happenings, standpoints, etc.*



## THE W.C.C. AGAIN

The Revd. David Gill, a senior executive of the World Council of Churches, Geneva, and involved in the Department of Church and Society has been in South Africa. His visit has once again focused attention on our South African attitudes to and knowledge of the World Council of Churches and its activities. Three issues appear to have come to the fore again.

Firstly, the presence of the Russian Orthodox Church in the W.C.C. does not imply Communist infiltration into the Council. And social action programmes operated by the W.C.C. are certainly not a result of the Orthodox Churches participation in the W.C.C. "Our social action programmes take place in spite of the Russian Churches, and not because of them".

Secondly, the role and importance of ecumenism. Because ecumenism is an expression of faith in larger terms than the "tribal" self-interests of e.g. Methodism, Roman Catholicism, Lutheranism or an English or Canadian tribalism, the W.C.C. is attempting to aid Churches in moving beyond their various boundaries. Applied practically, this implies "a readiness to listen to the discomfiting perspectives of others, and not just slapping labels on them". The history of the Church no doubt reveals the kind of "tribalism" Mr. Gill speaks about, and his seeing no hope of getting away from this until we look at others, is indeed both frightening and challenging.

Thirdly, there is the question of violence and non-violence. Mr. Gill spoke of "an appalling double standard". On the one hand there are the church buildings which contain the bloodstained colours of the Empire, and one sends off chaplains to the forces. But one thunders against violence when Africans (or others) start using it. There is, in other words, a clash of opinion between a State-sponsored violence, often equated with defence and oppression of evil, and hence seen as being justified by society, and, on the other hand, a revolutionary violence which generally is regarded by society as an unjustified method of change.

The role of the Church and of Christians is costly. For as the Old Testament prophets questioned values, norms and implementations of ideas of their societies in the light of God and His righteousness, and as Jesus spoke out when the need called for it, so the Church of today is called upon to question, speak and act. Applicable as this is to ALL the world, likewise it is a challenge to our part of Africa! Of necessity violence of all kinds must be regarded as evil. What alternative do WE offer?

—*Kairos, June 1973*



## S.A. CHURCHES TO SEND FULL TEAM TO WCC

The nine South African member churches of the World

*Hierdie rubriek in Afrikaans en Engels bevat kort uittreksels van berigte oor nuus, opvattinge, gebeure, standpunte, ens.*



Council of Churches have decided to send a full delegation to the next meeting of the central committee of the WCC.

This will allow the churches the opportunity of having the first formal discussions with the WCC on the question of grants-in-aid to banned organisations in Southern Africa. The grants were first made late in 1970.

The meeting will be held in Geneva from August 22 to 29. The S.A. Council of Churches will send Dr. Alex Borrairie and Mr. John Rees as its two voting representatives.

The nine churches will each send a non-voting representative.

To date eight of these have been chosen. They are: Rev. John Thorne (United Congregational), Rev. Edwin Pons (Presbyterian), Rt. Rev. Bill Burnett (Anglican), Rev. A.E. Hendrickse (Methodist), Rev. G.T. Vika (Bantu Presbyterian), Rt. Rev. D. Giessekke (Lutheran, Tvl.), Rev. D. Gqweta (Moravian, E. Cape), Mr. MacDonald September (Lutheran S.U. region).

The Moravian Church of the Western Cape has still to appoint its delegate.

None of the churches withdrew their membership of the W.C.C., but decided to maintain dialogue with the World Council.

—*Rand Daily Mail, 31.7.73*



## WIDE SUPPORT FOR VERLIGTE ACTION

The new "Verligte Action" movement launched in Johannesburg on Friday night has received nation-wide support from people of all political parties who are backing the group in its efforts to break the political logjam which is preventing vital adaptations in racial policies.

The aim is to hold a national convention within three months, where Verligte Action will be formally established as an organised national movement.

Professor Willem Joubert, Professor of Law at the University of South Africa was chairman of the meeting. He spelled out the basic philosophy of Verligte Action as follows:

- "That the South African nation is characterised by its multiformity, but that the groups comprising our society, in spite of group differences, have a common destiny.
- "That this multiformity and our mutual commitment as a nation make joint planning essential.
- "That all people, notwithstanding status, group loyalties of colour, are entitled to a life consonant with human dignity in the fullest sense of the world."

—*Sunday Times, 1.7.73.*



### THE 3% POLL

#### Massive Ovambo stay-away

The Ovambo people—who form nearly half the total population of South West Africa—have clearly rejected the Nationalist Government's separate development policy by shunning the first election ever held in their homeland.

When the 59 polling stations closed last night, an estimated three per cent of the 50 000 voters had used their ballots.

The reverberations of this massive setback to the Government's much-vaunted plans for the "showpiece" homeland will be felt in the South African political arena, at the United Nations in New York where political developments are constantly under view, and in domestic South West African politics where apartheid is frequently under fire.

Observers see the boycott as reflecting overall Ovambo opinion though the election is confined to two tribal groups.

Dr. Waldheim had reported that the majority of South West Africa's people wanted a complete severance from South Africa—and the Ovambos supported this opinion.

These are the vital statistics of the Ovambo election: The Legislative Assembly consists of 56 seats, 21 elected. Fifteen elected seats were not opposed. The other six—three each in the Kwanyama and Kwambi tribal areas—are being contested. The other 35 have been filled by nominees under the traditional tribal system.

—Rand Daily Mail, 3.8.73

### PASTOR EXPELLED FROM S.W.A.

WINDHOEK—The pastor of the German Evangelical Lutheran Church in the northern town of Otjiwarongo, the Rev. Wolfgang Kruger, has been ordered to leave South West Africa on or before June 30.

He is the seventh church official to be expelled from the mandated territory in the past 15 months.

The Department of the Interior gave no reasons for ordering him to leave S.W.A.

—Star, 12.6.73

### MASSIVE RACE CLASH COMING IN S.A. WARNS SMALL

Mr. Adam Small, head of the Department of Philosophy at the University of the Western Cape, last night warned a predominantly Afrikaans student audience in Stellenbosch that White attitudes were precipitating a massive racial confrontation in South Africa.

"The clock has already struck midnight when it comes to race relations in this country," he said. "All the indications are that we are on the verge of the precipice, if not already half-way down."

"Only a fool cannot see the possibility of physical confrontation."

The real problem at UWC was not in the institution itself but in the entire South African situation.

### DESPERATION

"The students there are speaking of the oppressive power structure in South Africa and saying they hate the oppressive White power. They are warning that their generation has had enough."

Asked for the solution, Mr. Small said bluntly: "For God's sake, White South Africa, share your power. At least sit round a conference table with a view to sharing that power".

### BLACK

He told another questioner that he regarded himself as Black because he wished to identify himself with "everybody on the side of the oppressed in South Africa."

—Rand Daily Mail, 25.7.73





"Sipho! If you don't convert that game from multi-racial to multi-national you'll have me arrested!"

—LAVON

### HUNGER BLAMED FOR MOST BLACK CHILD PATIENTS

More than 60 per cent of African children admitted to Baragwanath Hospital, near Johannesburg, were treated for malnutrition.

And 58 per cent of the children who attended a special pre-school clinic in Riverlea, a Johannesburg Coloured township, were underweight.

These facts were revealed by Professor John Hansen, head of the Department of Paediatrics at the University of the Witwatersrand, in Pretoria yesterday. Similar conditions, he said, could be found at almost any hospital and clinic in South Africa.

The causes of malnutrition in children in rural and urban areas could be blamed on poverty, ignorance, unstable or broken families and overpopulation, Professor Hansen said.

—Rand Daily Mail, 29.6.'73.

### FREEDOMS ERODED, SAYS PROG SPEAKER

Mr. Malcolm Douglas, chairman of the Progressive Party's finance committee, speaking at an Institute of Citizenship meeting on the State versus the individual, said the Government had eroded virtually every one of the basic freedoms. For the Coloured and African people this erosion was almost total, and for Whites it was nearly as complete.

The Nationalist Government was authoritarian in nature to a degree that was frightening. The individual's basic freedoms were subjected to the interests of the State and the rule of law had been eroded almost to vanishing point.

—The Argus

### STATISTICS OF SHAME

Land of sunshine, milk and honey: that's the usual image projected of South Africa. It is also the way in which most Whites see their country. It's nonsense, of course. And to remind us again of the true position are the statistics revealed during the past few days. At Johannesburg's giant Baragwanath Hospital more than 60 per cent of the African children admitted are treated for malnutrition. In speaking of this dismal fact, Professor John Hansen, head of Witwatersrand University's Department of Paediatrics, noted that similar conditions could be found at almost any hospital and clinic in South Africa. Supporting his view, the Witwatersrand Student Community Organisation has said that 57 per cent of Coloured children between two and six examined at its Riverlea clinic suffer from malnutrition; more than half of them have the protein deficiency disease, kwashiorkor.

As Professor Hansen pointed out, malnutrition can be blamed on a range of factors: poverty, ignorance, unstable or broken families, over-population.

But with a malnutrition incidence as startlingly high as we have in South Africa—and particularly among Blacks—doesn't the ultimate blame lie in our system of society? In a system which results in levels of wages which do not allow parents to feed their children properly? In retarded educational facilities for Blacks which must breed ignorance? In pass laws which must, by their nature, create broken families? In confined and overpopulated African "reserves"?

If South Africa is to give all its children a proper chance in life, there must be a massive overhauling of our system of society. That is the only way to get rid of the statistics of shame.

—Rand Daily Mail 4.7.73

### TREURNICHT EXPLAINS CHURCH AND RACE GROUPS

STELLENBOSCH—The Afrikaners were justified in taking steps to guarantee their continued existence, but they had an equally great obligation to do justice to the population groups, said Dr. A.P. Treurnicht, MP, said to be head of the Broederbond, when he spoke here last night.

Dr. Treurnicht was one of the speakers in a symposium on 'Church, Nation and Race' organised by the Sewentig Discussion Group.

He said in reply to a question that he believed the development of the Afrikaner nation was part of God's purpose and that Afrikaners, therefore, had a special mission. It was natural that as a small group they should take special steps to ensure their survival.

—The Argus.

### EQUAL PAY FOR ANGLICANS IN NATAL

DURBAN—The Anglican Church in Natal is leading other provinces in its decision to pay White and Black clergymen equal salaries next year.

All clergy will receive the same salaries from January—seven years earlier than planned.

—Rand Daily Mail, 4.7.'73

## NUWE PLAN VIR DISTRIK SES

Met die oog op „die nuwe denkrigtings oor die kleur-vraagstuk” gaan Kaapstad se stadsklerk, mnr. H.G. Heugh, nou waarskynlik aan die Sekretaris van Gemeenskapsbou, mnr. J.H. Niemand, skryf om te vra dat Distrik Ses 'n „onbepaalde gebied” vir alle rasse gemaak word.

Die stadsraad se bestuurskomitee het gister ingestem dat dit gedoen moet word. Mnr. Niemand moet gevra word om die Regering te nader om die raadsaamheid te heroorweeg dat dit 'n blanke gebied moet wees.

—*Die Burger*, 20.7.73

## MATIES STEL 'N BANTOELEKTRISE AAN

Stellenbosch het nou geskiedenis gemaak deur 'n Bantoevrou as dosente aan te stel. Dit is, sover vasgestel kan word, die eerste keer dat 'n Blanke universiteit 'n Bantoevrou in so 'n pos aanstel.

Die vrou is mev. E. Gxilishe wat aangestel is om studente te help met die regte uitspraak, idiomatiese uitdrukkings veral intonasie van Xhosa. Mev. Gxilishe is 'n opgeleide onderwyseres. Haar aanstelling is tydelik totdat die Regering beslis dat sy heeltyds aangestel kan word. Huisvesting word in die Bantoe-woonbuurt deur die universiteit voorsien.

—*Die Vaderland*, 12.6.73

## SAAM BID: PONT EN HEYNS BOTS

'n Verbod op gesamentlike aanbidding in kerkdienste deur verskillende rasse kan op geen Bybelse grondslag geregverdig word nie—slegs op politieke grondslag. Die idee van 'n geslote kerk kan daarom nie skriftuurlik geregverdig word nie.

Só het prof. J.A. Heyns, hoogleraar in dogmatiek aan die N.G. Teologiese Skool van UP gister hier gesê. Prof. A. Heyns het saam met prof. A.D. Pont, hoogleraar in kerkgeskiedenis van die Teologiese Skool van die Hervormde Kerk, op 'n besprekingskring van 'n nuwe Pretoriase besprekingsgroep, Datum 80, gepraat met spesiale verwysing na die Gereformeerde Ekumeniese Sinode in Sydney.

Prof. Heyns het gesê die stelling van eie inheemse kerke vir afsonderlike volksgroepe is 'n suiwer skriftuurlike beginsel—dit beteken nie dat die kerke vir lede van ander volkere gesluit kan word nie.

## DIENSTE

In die Suid-Afrikaanse situasie is dit daarom wenslik om lidmaatskap—maar nie wedersydse bywoning van dienste nie—te beperk.

Daarom kan hy geen enkele beswaar inbring teen tien van die vyftien besluite van die G.E.S. nie. „Ek sal persoonlik baie dankbaar wees as die N.G. Kerk al die besluite op sy volgende Sinode-sitting in Oktober aanvaar”.

Prof. Pont het gesê gesamentlike aanbidding is in alle omstandighede onnodig en selfs sinloos.

Die enigste Christelike eenheid is die eenheid van die geloof soos uitgedruk in die belydenisskrifte. Dis nooit nodig om die eenheid te demonstreer nie.

—*Die Transvaler*, 15.6.73

## HONEST AND JUST?

Sir,—It was reported in *The Argus* on April 30 that the Nederduits Hervormde Kerk had accepted apartheid as the only 'honest, just and Christian racial policy'. In *The Argus* on the same day we learned of the uprooting of a Coloured community at Brackenfell, and on May 3 was a report on the demolition of Coloured homes on a farm, leaving the occupants, who included sick children, at the mercy of the cold night air.

Is this the 'honest' and 'Christian' apartheid this church speaks of? How can a government policy that brings such social misery on fellow humans be Christian or just?

—*Terrence Mullard*  
*Rondebosch*

—*The Argus*, 11.5.73

## “WILGESPRUIT”

Remarkable conflict in findings of two inquiries

### DENDY YOUNG REJECTS SCHLEBUSCH

#### Charges against Wilgespruit dismissed

The allegations by the Schlebusch Commission against the Wilgespruit Fellowship Centre have been rejected by the Dendy Young Committee of Inquiry, which has in effect found Wilgespruit not guilty of the charges made against it.

In a report released yesterday, the Dendy Young Committee completely vindicates the controversial Prod (Personal Responsibility and Organisation Development Programme) sensitivity training groups at Wilgespruit. They were the main target of the Schlebusch report and were suspended by the Wilgespruit authorities immediately after the Schlebusch report.

The Dendy Young Committee recommends that the suspension be lifted.

The Dendy Young Committee then goes on to attack the core of the Schlebusch case against Wilgespruit by rejecting Schlebusch allegations. Below are the Schlebusch allegations and, in brackets, the Dendy Young findings.

- The PROD programmes were politically subversive. (They were not).
- The programmes were designed to brainwash participants. (They were not).
- Wilgespruit was unChristian. (It was rooted in Christianity).
- Dagga was smoked during programmes. (There was no evidence to support this allegation).
- Activities were carried on in an “air of mystery and secrecy” under “a cloak” of being connected with the Church. (Not correct. The activities were conducted openly).
- Wilgespruit was responsible for the “sex liturgies” staged by UCM. (The Committee exonerates Wilgespruit from responsibility).
- Trainers were insufficiently qualified. (The Committee was satisfied they were competent).
- Staff members were morally unfit to conduct the programmes. (No evidence to suggest this).

- \* The committee also questions the qualifications and accuracy of some of the witnesses who gave evidence to the Schlebusch Commission.

The Committee concludes: "Regarding the allegations made by the Schlebusch Commission in relation to persons, your Committee, while admitting indiscretions of speech and behaviour on the part of some staff members, can find no evidence to suggest that they are unfit to fill the posts they hold on the staff of the Wilgespruit Fellowship Centre.

"In the light of all the facts, and given the implementation of the recommendations contained in this report, your Committee believes that the Wilgespruit Fellowship Centre will continue to witness to Ecumenical Christianity and exercise a pioneering role for the Churches."

The Committee, in its 48-page report on Wilgespruit, closely examined the Schlebusch Commission allegations—and rejected them point by point.

The Inquiry Committee has now vindicated Wilgespruit, whose future hinges on two crucial questions: Will the Government accept the Dendy Young verdict? Or will it enforce its threat to take "necessary action"?

—*Sunday Times*, 22.7.73



### SENSITIVITY TRAINING PRAISED IN REPORT

The report of the Dendy Young Committee of Inquiry deals at length with the Wilgespruit Centre's sensitivity training—the controversial Personal Responsibility and Organisation Development Programme (PROD).

It questions the accuracy of evidence about sensitivity training submitted to the Schlebusch Commission. It points out that the clinical psychologist who condemned PROD had never participated in a T-group himself and was in "direct conflict" with expert evidence tendered to the Committee.

Referring to the "mystery witness" who gave evidence about experiences on a Wilgespruit T-group, but declined to give evidence to the Committee of Inquiry, it notes:

"The evidence of the Schlebusch report, taken from one witness, appears, in the light of evidence taken from a majority of the other members of the same T-group, to be out of context, unreliable and factually inaccurate."

It recommends that:

- \* Consideration be given to the lifting of the suspension of PROD as soon as possible.
- \* PROD restrict its services to Christian, educational and social service groups.
- \* Action to be taken to set up an association of sensitivity trainers.
- \* Closer links should be forged between the Council of Churches and Wilgespruit in the areas of staffing and administration.
- \* A "summit meeting" of churches be called to promote understanding of Wilgespruit and to bring its activities to "its wider constituency".

The report comments: "That Wilgespruit is working towards social change which, it is hoped, will result in a greater degree of social justice, is manifest. It is conceived to

be the duty of every Christian, indeed every citizen, to be aware of the pressures which indicate the need for social change and strive by peaceful and positive action for a just order of society."

It stresses that the programmes were noted used for psychotherapeutic purposes. "It is purely an educational programme."

—*Sunday Times*, 22.7.73



### THE COMMITTEE

The Dendy Young Committee of Inquiry was established after the Prime Minister, Mr. Vorster, had agreed to allow time for the South African Council of Churches to "clear up that nest of iniquity" at Wilgespruit in its own way.

The Committee of Inquiry consisted of 13 members comprising leading members of the Council of Churches and the Wilgespruit Management Committee, Mr. J.R. Dendy Young was the chairman.

The investigating committee included: Bishop P. Buthelezi; Mrs. S. Motlana; the Rev. J. Wing; the Rev. K. Schmale; the Rev. E. Pons; Mr. John C. Rees; Mr. K. Foster; Mr. C. Nettleton; the Rev. M.H. Maasdorp; the Rev. V. Kotze; the Rev. T. Derkx; the Rev. M. Molala. Mr. A. Brink occasionally deputised for Mr. Molala.

—*Sunday Times*, 22.7.73



### NO TO SCHLEBUSCH

CAPE TOWN—The South African Council of Churches decided unanimously at its national conference in Rondebosch yesterday to cease to co-operate voluntarily with the Schlebusch Commission of Inquiry into certain organisations.

The conference was endorsing a resolution passed in June by its executive committee which stated:

"The executive committee recognises that this resolution is in no way binding on affiliated churches or organisations of the South African Council of Churches which decide to refuse to testify before the commission. The executive acknowledges the right of a person to make a personal decision as to whether he will give evidence or not.

"The executive hereby instructs the general secretary, in whose custody all documents of the council are placed, not to produce any of the S.A. Council of Churches documents unless subpoenaed to do so by the commission.

—*Rand Daily Mail*, 3.8.73



### RANDALL WILL BLAME UP FOR SCHLEBUSCH ACTION

Mr. Peter Randall, the director of Spro-cas, said yesterday that if action was taken against him for refusing to testify to the Schlebusch Commission, he would blame the United Party for "its collaboration in this whole, shameful affair".

The national conference of the South African Council of Churches yesterday called on churches to support the families of people who were penalised for not testifying before the Schlebusch Commission.

—*Rand Daily Mail*, 3.8.73



### PERSPECTIVE ON WILGESPRUIT

Should the Wilgespruit Fellowship Centre be damned or praised? Was the Prime Minister, Mr. Vorster, right to castigate it as a "nest of iniquity"? Or is it an institution rooted in Christianity whose activities are largely beyond reproach?

The public can now decide for itself. It now has two sharply conflicting reports available, both based on investigation into Wilgespruit—the Government's Schlebusch Commission and the committee of inquiry set up by the S.A. Council of Churches with Mr. J.R. Dendy Young as chairman.

Even before comparing the substance of the two reports, revealing and fundamental differences are evident.

*First*, the Schlebusch inquiry was held in secret; Dendy Young was conducted in public.

*Second*, the Schlebusch record of evidence has not been released and no indication has been given as to whether it ever will be. The Dendy Young committee was reported on contemporaneously and everyone has been able to see what it is all about; more, a record of the proceedings is available to anyone who wants to read it.

*Third*, while it is an offence for anyone who was called before Schlebusch to breathe a word about what transpired, no such secrecy applies to the Dendy Young sittings.

*Fourth*, the identities of all the Schlebusch witnesses are not known; in the case of Dendy Young there has been relatively full disclosure, enabling the public to make its own assessments of the weight to be given to evidence.

*Fifth*, those appearing before Schlebusch could not know what "charges" they were facing; they could not know whether they were merely witnesses or actually in the position of being accused. In the Dendy Young inquiry, the Wilgespruit people knew the allegations against them—and had full opportunity to reply.

That indeed was the essential distinguishing fact between

the two inquiries, with Dendy Young following the normal procedures of our law in affording people accused of wrongdoing the opportunity to challenge and rebut.

In such light, there is enormous significance in the entirely different findings. The Dendy Young committee, with a wealth of expert evidence to draw on, denies, contradicts, rejects or dismisses every single major adverse Schlebusch finding. It vindicates sensitivity training and all the Christian endeavour at Wilgespruit, which basically, it finds, amount to working legally and peacefully towards social change in South Africa. And concerning the persons in charge, they are cleared of the implications of moral degeneracy in the Schlebusch report. What slight criticisms of them remain are at the level of normal human fallibility.

Clearly, on such evidence, the Prime Minister owes Wilgespruit an apology. He should tender it without delay. He needs also to withdraw his threat of unspecified action—for the churches' own inquiry has largely given the institution a clean bill of health.

Equally clearly, there is now greater reason than ever before for doubting the judgment and methods of the Schlebusch Commission—not merely concerning Wilgespruit, but also in regard to the National Union of South African Students. Eight students were banned as a result of the commission's initial report. Enough information has already been put forward to show that the Schlebusch view of Nusas was distorted and one-sided. With the additional knowledge now available of how wrong it was about Wilgespruit, don't the interests of justice demand a fresh look at the case of the eight banned?

And with all this, the Schlebusch Commission is still sitting and is now investigating the Institute of Race Relations, the Christian Institute and the disbanded University Christian Movement. Isn't it, however, time to call a halt to these inquiries conducted by laymen drawn from political parties? And if the Government insists on continuing with this sort of thing isn't it time the United Party finally cleared out of the commission?  
—Rand Daily Mail, 23.7.73.