



PRO VERITATE

HANS HÄSELBARTH

Recent criticism of the Two Kingdom doctrine in the light of
the South African situation

B. J. VAN DER MERWE †

Alles tevergeefs . . . of alles nuut?

JAMES POLLEY

Gospel or ideology in South Africa? (3)

PROFESSOR A. VAN SELMS

Geskiedenis as waarskuwing

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

Volume VII No. VIII | Jaargang VII Nr. VIII

Dec. 15 Des.

PRO VERITATE

REDAKSIE

REDAKTEUR:

Dr. B. Engelbrecht.

REDAKSIONELE KOMITEE:

Biskop B. B. Burnett; Eerw. J. de Gruchy; Eerw. A. W. Habelgaarn; Eerw. E. E. Mahabane; Eerw. J. E. Moulder; Ds. C. F. B. Naudé, (Voorsitter); Eerw. R. Orr; Prof. dr. A. van Selms.

ADMINISTRASIE/ KORRESPONDENSIE

SIRKULASIEBESTUURDER:

Dr. W. B. de Villiers.

Alle briewe vir die redaksie en administrasie aan: Posbus 31135, Braamfontein, Johannesburg.

INTEKENGELD

Intekengeld is vooruit-betaalbaar.

Land- en seepos: R1 (10/- of \$1.40) — Afrika; R1.50 (15/- of \$2.10) — Oorsee; 17/6 — Engeland.

Lugpos: R2.00 (£1 of \$2.80) — Afrika; R3.50 (£1.17.6 of \$5.00) — Oorsee; £2 — Engeland.

Tjeks en posorders moet uitgemaak word aan Pro Veritate (Edms.) Bpk., Posbus 31135, Braamfontein, Johannesburg.

LET WEL

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

PRO VERITATE verskyn elke 15de van die maand.

(Prys per enkel-eksemplaar 10c)

CHRISTIAN MONTHLY FOR SOUTHERN AFRICA CHRISTELIKE MAANDBLAD VIR SUIDELIKE AFRIKA

IN HIERDIE UITGAWE

- Eerw. H. Häselbarth, wat deur die Regering aangesê is om die land te verlaat, het tydens 'n byeenkoms van Lutherse kerkleiers wat vroeër vanjaar te Rustenburg plaasgevind het, 'n indringende referaat gelewer oor kritiek wat daar teenswoordig teen die Lutherse leer van die „Twee Ryke” ingebring word, en die soeklig skerp laat val op die Christelike getuieis ten opsigte van die politiek in Suid-Afrika vandag. Bl. 4
- In sy Oujaarspreek op 31 Desember 1967 het wyle dr. B. J. van der Merwe, na aanleiding van Pred. 3:15 en II Kor. 5:17, die vraag bespreek of vir die Christen „alles tevergeefs”, en of dit „alles nuut” is. Bl. 9
- In sy derde artikel oor evangelie en ideologie in Suid-Afrika, bespreek eerw. James Polley sekere apartheidswette in ons land wat 'n openbaring is van hoe fel die apartheidsideologie met die Christelike geloof in stryd is. Bl. 11
- Prof. B. B. Keet skryf oor twee belangrike uitsprake wat buitelandse kerkliggame onlangs gedoen het oor apartheid in Suid-Afrika. Bl. 15
- Prof. A. van Selms bespreek die „Openbare Les” van dr. C. J. Labuschagne by geleentheid van sy aanvaarding van die amp van lektor in die Ou Testamentiese Letterkunde en Uitlegging van die Ou Testament aan die Rijksuniversiteit te Groningen, en wys op die toepaslikheid daarvan op ons Suid-Afrikaanse situasie. Bl. 16

IN THIS ISSUE...

- The Rev. H. Häselbarth of Mapumulo, who was notified by the Government that he has to leave the country, delivered a significant lecture earlier this year at a meeting of Lutheran church leaders at Rustenburg on recent criticisms of the Lutheran doctrine of the "Two Kingdoms", and sharply focussed the searchlight on the Christian witness with regard to politics in South Africa today. P. 4
- In his Old Year's sermon on the 31st December, 1967, the late Dr. B. J. van der Merwe discussed the question, with reference to Eccl. 3:15 and II Cor. 5:17, whether for Christians all is "in vain", or whether all things are "new". P. 9
- In his third article on 'Gospel or ideology in South Africa?' the Rev. James Polley discusses some of the apartheid laws in our country which reveal the inconsistency of the ideology of apartheid with the Christian faith. P. 11
- Prof. B. B. Keet writes about two important statements which church institutions abroad have recently made on apartheid. P. 15
- Prof. A. van Selms reviews the "Public Lecture" which was given by Dr. C. J. Labuschagne on the occasion of his assumption of duty as lecturer of Old Testament Literature and Exposition of the Old Testament at the State University, Groningen, and points out its relevance for the South African situation. P. 16

Inleidingsartikel:

ADVENT

Die tyd wat aan Kersfees voorafgaan, word in die kerklike spraakgebruik die adventstyd genoem. Daarmee word uitgedruk dat dit 'n tyd is waarin ons iets tegemoetgaan, 'n tyd waarin iets aan die kom is, 'n tyd waarin ons ons gereedmaak. Die naderende Kersfees vervul ons met 'n gevoel van vreugdevolle afwagting en in die adventstyd berei ons ons voor vir die feestelike herdenking van die gebeurtenis toe die ewige Seun van God in die wêreld ingekom het en as 'n mens in die midde van die Joodse volk gebore is.

Advent in die Bybel word ook gekenmerk deur hierdie allesdeurdringende vreugde. So was dit reeds by die profete wat die koms van die Messias voorspel het. Ons dink maar aan die bekende woorde uit Jesaja 9: „Die volk wat in duisternis wandel, het 'n groot lig gesien; die wat woon in die land van die doodskaduwee, oor hulle het 'n lig geskyn. U het die nasie vermenigvuldig, hulle vreugde groot gemaak; hulle is vrolik voor u aangesig soos iemand vrolik is in die oestyd, soos iemand juig as die buit verdeel word . . . Want 'n Kind is vir ons gebore, 'n Seun is aan ons gegee; en die heerskappy is op sy skouer, en Hy word genoem: Wonderbaar, Raadsman, Sterke God, Ewige Vader, Vrededors — tot vermeerdering van die heerskappy en tot vrede sonder einde . . .” En die profetewoord sou eeue later in engelesang weerklink as die goeie tyding van groot blydschap oor die aarde uitgejubel word met „Eer aan God in die hoogste hemele en vrede op aarde, in die mense 'n welbehag” (Luk. 2).

Tog laat die Bybel ons ook 'n ander kant sien. Hier dink ons veral aan die prediking van Johannes die Doper. Die diepste grondtoon van vreugde is weliswaar ook dáárin onmiskenbaar, maar vir Johannes het die koms van die Here in 'n sondige wêreld onvermydelik ook iets angswekkends ingehou. Wanneer die Heilige so in die onheiligheid van 'n wêreld van sonde en ongeregtheid indaal, geskied dit ook tot oordeel en gaan dit gepaard met 'n noodsaaklike gerig. Die Here kom om Koning te wees oor sy volk op die berg Sion, van nou af tot in ewigheid (Miga 4:7); Hy kom om Koning te wees oor die hele aarde (Sag. 14:9). Daarom moet daar in die „wildernis” van hierdie wêreld 'n grootpad gelyk gemaak word vir onse God (Jes. 40:3, vgl. Matt. 3:3).

As die koninkryk van die hemele naby kom, moet die mensdom hom bekeer. Want Hy wat kom, kom om op 'n gereinigde en skoongeveegde aarde te heers. Die sonde word uitgedelg en die kwaad word vir goed oorwin en ter syde gestel. Waar daar geen bekering, geen verandering van hart en gesindheid, geen lewensverbetering en 'n radikale omkering op die weg van sonde plaasvind nie, daar sal sy aanwesigheid een wees van verdoggende toorn. Sy skop is in sy hand, en Hy sal sy dorsvloer deur en deur skoonmaak en sy koring in die skuur saambring, maar die kaf sal Hy met onuitbluslike

vuur verbrand — so preek en waarsku Johannes. Aan hulle wat vir hom vra: „Wat moet ons doen?” Wát is bekering en wat word van ons verwag? gee hy die antwoord dat dit uit moet wees met alle hebsug en selfsug onder die mense, met alle bedrog en geveinsdheid, met alle onreg en geweld (vgl. Luk. 3:10v.).

Johannes was met sy oproep tot bekering geheel en al ter sake. Die felheid en die skerpte daarvan was in geen enkele opsig oordrewe of misplaas nie. Dat die koms van die Here noodwendig ook 'n uitdelging van die sonde en van alles wat teen Hom in opstand is, moét beteken, is deur Johannes met die helderheid van die Gees van God self ingesien. Sy oordeelsprediking is wáár, tot in elke letter daarvan.

En tog was hierdie groot adventsprediker sy tyd enigsins vooruit. Hy was God ook enigsins vooruit. Stellig sou daar 'n uitdelging van die sonde plaasvind, maar in die offer wat die Koning self sou bring deur éérs die barmhartige Hoëpriester te wees wat met sy eie lewe sou instaan vir die sondaars en aan die kruis die oordeel van God oor die wêreld sou dra; en stellig sou daar 'n oorwinning wees oor die kwaad en oor die dood, maar in die opstanding van Jesus; en stellig sou die „nuwe lewe” aanbreek, maar dit sou in die hemel saam met Christus verberg word in God.

Hierdie goddelike uitstel het egter aan Johannes se adventsprediking dié betekenis verleen dat dit 'n ongehoorde aktualiteit vir alle tye ontvang het.

Ons verwagting is nou gerig op die weerkoms van Jesus. As barmhartige Hoëpriester het Hy eenmaal gekom, maar so sal Hy nie weer kom nie. Tans is Hy dit nog, en sy heerskappy in die hemel aan die regterhand van die Vader is die genadeheerskappy van ons ewige Koning as ons Voorpraak en ons Voorbidder wat steeds vir ons intree op grond van sy volbragte offer. Maar wie nou met sy hoop en verwagting op Kersfees gerig staan, verwag die koms van die ewige Regter. Die adventsbodskap van Johannes het eers ná die kruisoffer van Jesus, sy opstanding en sy hemelvaart dié eintlike geldigheid en dié eintlike dringendheid verkry waarmee die Doper dit eenmaal in die woestyn van Judéa uitgeroep het. Nou eers is dit ten volle waar in al die huiweringwekkende erns waarmee dit toe gepreek is.

Wie die koms van Jesus verwag, verwag Hom as die Een wat eenmaal so genadig was dat daardie genade, as Hy verskyn, slegs nog oordeel kan beteken vir dié wat Hom verwerp. Bekering omdat die koninkryk van die hemele naby gekom het, is vir hierdie wêreld, vir ons land, vir alle mense die toepassing by uitnemendheid van die adventsbodskap. Tog is ons vreugde in die Kerstyd beslis nie misplaas nie, want die koms wat ons verwag, is 'n koms wat die uiteindelijke, volkome redding van

die wêreld en die aanbrenking van die Goddryk in heerlijkheid inhou. Maar ons sou van Kersfees 'n bespotlikheid maak as ons die oë daarvoor gesluit sou hou dat die lig van die ewige redding wat oor ons daag, nie sonder die skaduwee van die ewige oordeel en die ewige verwerping sal wees nie; as ons dus Kersfees sou wil vier sonder om ons te bekeer.

Met hierdie besef dus van wat advent in werklikheid beteken, moet ons wel met beklemde gemoedere dink aan die uitbundige „adventgees“ wat hom weer vanjaar in ons eie land en in ons eie samelewing gaan openbaar. Hoeveel dinge is daar

nie wat die skaduwee van die oordeel en die komende getig dreigend en donker oor ons laat val en die stempel van 'n skreeuende ironie op ons adventsvreugde afdruk nie! Baie is daar voorwaar wat sal moet verander sodat dit ook in Suid-Afrika eg weer advent kan word. In ons persoonlike lewe en in ons maatskaplike verhoudinge, in die kerk en in die staat, in die godsdiens en in die politiek . . . En alles kan onder die bekende profetewoord uit Jes. 56:1 saamgevat word: „So sê die Here: Bewaar die reg en doen geregtigheid; want my heil is naby om te kom en my geregtigheid om geopenbaar te word“.

Die Redaksie en Direksie van Pro Veritate wil al ons lesers en medewerkers graag van harte bedank vir hulle getroue ondersteuning gedurende die afgelope jaar en hulle almal 'n Geseende Kersfees en 'n voorspoedige Nuwe Jaar toewens.

Editorial:

ADVENT

The period preceding Christmas is called the time of Advent in ecclesiastical parlance. Thereby is signified that it is a time in which we are moving towards something, a time in which something is due to come, a time in which we are preparing ourselves. The approaching Christmas fills us with a feeling of joyful expectation and during Advent we prepare ourselves for the festive commemoration of what happened when the eternal Son of God came into the world and was born as a man in the midst of the Jewish people.

In the Bible, too, Advent is characterised by this all-pervading joy. This was already so in the case of the prophets who predicted the coming of the Messiah. Let us only recall the words of Isaiah 9: "The people that walked in darkness have seen a great light: they that dwell in the land of the shadow of death, upon them hath the light shined. Thou hast multiplied the nation and increased the joy: they joy before thee according to the joy in harvest and as men rejoice when they divide the spoil . . . For unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given: and the government shall be upon his shoulder: and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, The mighty God, The everlasting Father,

The Prince of Peace. Of the increase of his government and peace there shall be no end . . ." And the word of the prophet would find an echo centuries later in the song of angels when the good tidings of great joy were shouted forth across the earth with "Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace, goodwill toward men" (Luke 2).

Yet the Bible also gives us a glimpse of the other side of the coin. And what is especially relevant in this connection is the preaching of John the Baptist. The deepest ground-note of joy is also unmistakable there, to be sure, but for John the coming of the Lord into a sinful world also contained something terrifying. When the Holy One thus descends upon the unholiness of a world of sin and unrighteousness, it also happens by way of judgment and goes hand in hand with a necessary day of judgment. The Lord comes to be the King of His people on Mount Zion, henceforth unto eternity (Micha 4:7); He comes to be King over all the earth (Zech. 14:9). Therefore a highway has to be made straight for our God in the "wilderness" of this world (Is. 40:3, cf. Matth. 3:3).

When the kingdom of the heavens draws near mankind must convert itself. For He Who comes,

comes to rule upon a purified and cleanswept earth. Sin is demolished and evil is conquered and set aside for ever. Where no conversion, no change of heart and mind, no betterment of life and radical about-turn on the road of sin takes place, His presence will be one of destroying wrath. His shovel is ready in His hand, to win now His threshing-floor and gather the wheat into His granary; but He will burn the chaff on an unquenchable fire — so John preaches and warns. To those who ask of him: "Then what are we to do?", What is conversion and what is expected of us? he replies that there must be no more covetousness and selfishness among men, no more deceit and hypocrisy, no more injustice and violence (cf Luke 3:10f.).

John's call for conversion was most apposite. Its harshness and incisiveness were in no single respect exaggerated or misdirected. John saw with the clarity of the Spirit of God Himself that the coming of the Lord inevitably also **had** to mean a destruction of sin and of everything opposed to Him. His preaching of judgment is true, up to the last letter.

And yet this great preacher of the Advent was somewhat ahead of his time. He was also slightly ahead of God. A demolition of sin would indeed take place, but then in the sacrifice which the King Himself would make by first being the merciful High Priest who would forfeit His own life for sinners and would bear God's judgment of the world on the cross; and there would indeed be a victory over evil and death, but then in the resurrection of Jesus; and the "new life" would indeed dawn, but it would be hidden in heaven with Christ in God.

This divine postponement, however, gave John's preaching of the Advent a peculiar and unheard of significance for all time.

Our expectation now is directed at the Second coming of Jesus. Once He came as High Priest, but thus He will not come again. At the moment this is what He still is, and His sovereignty in heaven at the right hand of the Father is the merciful sovereignty of our eternal King as our Mediator and Intercessor Who is interceding for us all along on the strength of His accomplished sacrifice. But

He who now looks forward to Christmas with hope and expectation is expecting the coming of the eternal Judge. John's message of Advent only acquired the real validity and the real urgency, with which the Baptist proclaimed it in the desert of Judea once upon a time, after the sacrifice of Jesus on the cross, His resurrection and His ascension to heaven. Only now is it utterly true in all the terrifying sincerity with which it was then proclaimed.

Whoever expects the coming of Jesus, expects Him as the One Who was once so merciful that that mercy, when He appears, can only mean judgment for those who reject Him. The ultimate application of the message of Advent for this world, for our country, for all men can only be found in conversion because the kingdom of the heavens has drawn nigh. Yet our joy in the Christmas season is not misplaced, for the coming we expect is a coming which entails the ultimate, the complete salvation of the world and the advent of the Kingdom of God in all its glory. But we would make of Christmas something ludicrous if we were to close our eyes to the fact that the light of eternal salvation which is dawning on us is not unaccompanied by the shadow of eternal judgment and eternal rejection; if therefore, we were to celebrate Christmas without changing our lives.

In this realisation of what Advent really means we must certainly regard with heavy hearts the exuberant "spirit of Advent" which once again will evince itself in our own country and in our own society. How much is there not which causes the shadow of judgment and its coming to fall darkly and threateningly upon us and to stamp our joy of Advent with the mark of screaming irony! Much will have to be changed forsooth so that it could genuinely become **Advent** again also in South Africa. In our personal lives, in our social relationships, in the church and in the state, in religion and in politics . . . And everything can be summarised in the well-known words of the prophet Isaiah (56:1) "Thus saith the Lord, Keep ye judgment, and do justice: for my salvation is near to come, and my righteousness to be revealed."

The Directors and Editorial Staff of Pro Veritate wish to thank all our readers and contributors most heartily for their faithful support during the past year and to wish all of them a blessed Christmas and a prosperous New Year.

Recent Criticism of the Two Kingdom Doctrine in the Light of the South African Situation

— H. HÄSELBARTH*

At the Geneva conference on Church and Society in 1966 the delegates of the "Third World" were in the majority. They represented the voice of those 75 countries which, having been mostly former colonies of the western powers, have to struggle with low incomes of their population. Two thirds of the world population live in these countries, but altogether they own a mere 1/6th of the wealth of the earth. Once more the attention of the Churches has been drawn to the widening gap between the affluent white societies of the west and the poverty of the non-white majority in the south and the east, a racial and economical gulf that today endangers the peace of the world more than the ideological differences between East and West.

In the light of this prospect the South African situation is not unique, as it has been maintained so often in defence of the present policy. On a small scale South Africa contains in its borders the problems, sins, fears and frustrations which beset the world at large. In our country a white minority tries to uphold the status quo by way of racial separation under the name of "separate development". What idealists among the supporters of this policy have hailed as a way to eliminate friction between the race-groups, does appear to more and more among those who suffer under its implementation as acts of collective selfishness of a minority group. At present we enjoy internal peace on the surface, but those who live in day to day contact with Africans, Indians and Coloureds on an intimate level, will testify, that the wave of distrust and hatred does not abate.

The South African political experiment, implemented against the tide of world history, is bound to fail — despite technical achievements here and there — if it fails on this basic human level. In the meantime few are continuing to enjoy one of the highest standards of living in the world, in the face of the many, who continue to live with incomes below the minimum existence. Courageous men have in time tried to work for peaceful integration but many of the most outspoken ones have been silenced. Nevertheless the status quo cannot last. Lack of love and the numbers around the white citadel will bring about a change. "Terrorists" have appeared on the borders — ominous signs of the time — which

should move us to awake and to repent. The messengers of judgment have come.

What does it mean that in this situation of a South Africa that is shaped by men there exists the Church of Christ on both sides of the colour line? How does she represent the Lord in this world?

I. The Intention of the Two Kingdom Doctrine

The Church in the world — that leads us to the Two Kingdoms as a means of interpretation by which we try to understand how God is at work in the world, besides the fact that He works with the Gospel in the Church. "The issue is just this: How God continues to keep alive a world which has fallen prey to death, after the new aeon in Christ has already been inaugurated in its midst and has become a reality in the life of Christians through the Holy Spirit."¹ I would like to hold this positive intention of the Two Kingdom Doctrine against the seeming hopelessness of the South African policy. I can hope for South Africa because I am a Christian.

Let me unfold some aspects of the Two Kingdom Doctrine:

Luther distinguished the two regiments of God in order to safeguard *the unity of God's work in creation and redemption* against a persistent threat levelled against the goodness of the creation by men. Karl Barth, coming from a different angle, tries to bring out the same intention in his description of the Christian and the civil congregations as the two concentric circles around Christ the centre of both. God's work of cre-

ation must have its place in the Christian life and therefore the Christian lives under two regiments. It is not correct to draw a conclusion, as if the "world-person" can be separated from the "Christ-person", as if there existed a sphere which cannot come under the influence of faith. The "two persons" are Luther's attempt to prevent a separation of the worldly sphere from Christian life. The creation is the outward condition for the covenant of Christ, that is, even behind the creation there is Christ and his kingdom. Therefore the ultimate border-line cannot be drawn between the two regiments, between Church and world, but between the kingdom of Christ and the kingdom of the devil. This can be clarified at the point of *justice*. If the two regiments belong ultimately together, then civil justice is not a lesser justice than Christian justice. Both must be seen in the light of God's justification. Usually civil justice is too easily degraded to mean "only" the maintenance of civil order in the state (*primus usus legis*). But this would make it too easy for the state to adjust this justice to its own policy. This civil justice is rather the place of Christian obedience and witness. Think what this means for our concern for justice and equal rights for all people in South Africa! The obedience of faith takes the world seriously in its worldliness. Within the framework of civil justice works of sanctification can be performed. Not outside and beyond, but within this sphere are Christian decisions made for in this world the kingdom of God comes. In the face of so much abuse of God's created world Christians say "yes" to the world and they are suspicious of those who have contempt for it.

II. The Two Kingdom Doctrine as a means of orientation

Truly, the Two Kingdom Doctrine cannot possibly serve as a program of social ethics, but it can serve as a "border-line definition" (H. D.

Wendland), or as a "means of orientation" (H. Bornkamm), for Christians to understand their role and actions in the world. Let me outline in which way I regard the concept as still being relevant for us today.

A. Insofar as its meaning includes a final unity of both regiments it is a protest against the exclusion of the sphere of politics from God's kingdom. That means, South Africa, with all its people is still God's property, for God's sake and for man's sake it has not yet been handed over to the devil. It must therefore not be regarded as the scape-goat of evil in Africa. Its people and even its leadership is as bad and as good as all men. Those who have given up hope by emigrating either literally or spiritually from it as well as those who would like to resort to acts of violence to change the existing condition must know what they are doing. God's regiment is still in force. This does not exclude emigration and even resistance, but it holds Christians responsible in what they do.

B. South Africa's problems are of such magnitude that they cannot be faced without prophetic and even utopic vision. Generally, however, the Two Kingdom Doctrine guards against an unqualified trust of enthusiast ideologies. The latter usually follow the scheme: first let us wage this war or implement this policy and destroy our enemies (the Nationalist Party or the African Nationalist movement, or the liberals, or the Communists), then there will be peace and prosperity. But men must live even when one policy has failed. In politics the ends usually do *not* justify the means, especially if people other than oneself is expected to suffer. The present cost of suffering (of re-settlement schemes, of restrictions in basic freedoms, of security laws, of terrorism etc.) must be taken much more seriously.

C. That leads us once more to an acceptance of the world as God's creation. Men are invited to analyse the existing situation, to use reason and imagination, to reckon with complex political realities, to work in secular professions and to cooperate with non-Christians of good will — in order to seek the best of the city. Progressive Lutherans advise us to stress such Christian pragmatism. Men like W. Trillhaas and William H. Lazareth urge that

we should reclaim and defend Luther's deep appreciation of the political realities and the sanctified worldliness of the civil life. Within the wake of a further breakdown of old cherished religious tradition among Africans, Coloureds and especially among Whites in the Afrikaans speaking section — due to industrial expansion and urbanization — South African Christians will be in need of such an unbiased attitude to the secular world.

D. The Two Kingdom Doctrine further serves as a protest against clerical domination over the state. I need not stress the relevance of this reminder against a mixing of the two "regiments" on the South African scene. May it suffice to say that the Church has over the years helped considerably to shape the policy of the country which has had its effects on mission work and partly led to the spread of the sectarian movements. Christianity was too easily identified with the defence of the case of the Whites.

E. Lastly, the doctrine reminds us that we live in a time prior to eschatological fulfilment. That Christ is Lord is a confession of Christians but not yet a description of the state of affairs as we see them in the world. A battle is still waged, the people of God are still on a pilgrimage, admonitions are still needed. There is that knowledge of the tension of the NT between the "already" of Christ's victory and the "not yet" of ongoing resistance. That means to us that the theology of the cross is of utmost relevance. Christ is Lord not in a rule of power, but precisely as the crucified and dying one in his suffering and defeat without any temporal hope. This will make us suspicious of our own personal and collective yearning for power and help us to become more compassionate with all those who suffer. It should especially in our Churches make us aware of the lack of diaconic commitment. There may not be any other way by which unity in the Lutheran Church between White and non-White congregations is granted but only through compassion. If White Christians in South Africa had taken the suffering of their African, Indian and Coloured brothers more to their heart, then we would be one.

III. Popular Misconceptions about the Two Kingdoms

There is a very influential camp within almost all the South African Churches which unknowingly lives and argues according to a misconception of the Two Kingdom Doctrine. Its position is less characterized by a simple attitude of abandoning the world to the "ruler of this world" but by an institutionalized Church which tries to maintain its established order in the world like an island. Such a wrongly conceived diaspora mentality easily takes its religion as a means to escape its environment. Where it leaves the position of non-interference, it usually adjusts itself to the dominant way of life. From here Christian engagement in social and political problems of South Africa of a prophetic-critical kind is looked at with deep suspicion. This view is inadvertently supported by others, among them Africans in higher positions, who say, "our time has not come. Engagement now would lead to unnecessary individual suffering without results". Along these lines the Church in South Africa is often a diplomatic Church which is more interested in its own survival than in the future of the South African people. On the point of political witness it thus carefully avoids the way of the cross. This attitude springs from a very honest desire to keep the Church "intact" and out of the battle-zone. Its arguments are these:

(a) Politics do not belong on the pulpit (would Jesus or the prophets have agreed?)

(b) Decisions of a socio-political nature which require common sense and reasoning must not be legitimized by the Gospel.

(c) We are satisfied with a state which succeeds in averting chaos.

(d) Decisions on the South African scene are so complex and need expert understanding that theologians and churches should not interfere.

(e) The ministry of the word has been instituted to help the world with the good tidings but not with an attempt to change people by way of improving the conditions of life.

(f) Church must remain Church, it has to leave an engagement in politics to the informed Christian politician.

It is these arguments from this very influential camp which make it necessary to list the danger-points of the Two Kingdom Doctrine and confront them to our situation.

IV. The Dualism of the Two Kingdom Concept rejected

We accept the plain fact that our country cannot be ruled with the Gospel and that the Church ought not become a political pressure-group. We are alert to reject any enthusiastic hope that the world can be made better. But can this be our last word? Is this attitude not often a simple lack of imagination which breeds resignation?

Certainly this is not the intention of the conception of the two realms. We must not accept the conditions of fallen creation in world history and society as if they were guided by unalterable laws of their own. In this way ideologies take over and prescribe the precept for the individual's action. No wonder, then, if our Churches in South Africa merely reflect the existing race pattern of the outside world and are hardly able to exclude daily discrimination from their own ranks. Are we not guilty of sin, if our attitudes to our neighbours are shaped by the so-called 'South African Way of Life'? This question suggests that we must be more deeply concerned with the inner connection of the two realms of creation and redemption, that is with the way in which Christ's death and resurrection and the guidance of the Holy Spirit actually affect the present social and political order. What, for instance, does it mean when we baptize and have Holy Communion in the name of Jesus Christ? Can such oneness with the Lord be celebrated in such a way that brothers are excluded on the principle of colour? If not, how much expression of a new fellowship do we allow in our midst? Those who experience such fellowship in congregations, in worship, in education, in visiting, in joint mission work, in singing, playing and eating together, will testify that integration works, it does not necessarily lead to friction and domination or chaos. It rather eliminates complexes, it establishes mutual bonds of trust and gratitude. Is not such building of cells of fellowship a service which we can render to South Africa, a service more promising than the government can ever hope to receive from its citizens?

Now, to be sure, such living of unity cannot always be called a model for the world, but it is nevertheless an alternative "way of life" of utmost political value, a sign within the country that points to the

future — as at one time the miracles of Jesus were signs for the kingdom. Is this utopia which I have outlined, is this clerical arrogance?

We maintain that there is no public sphere in which Christian witness can have no validity. We also say that the concept of the two realms does not support any standards of a double morality. From a knowledge that the world is to be governed by other rules than that of the Sermon on the Mount we must not too quickly concede own immanent laws to the world. From which point could then the use of power still be checked? How can then a good state be distinguished from an evil one? Are we legalistic when we say this, does such thinking in ethical norms betray an authoritarian spirit? Must we not be afraid that a state left to itself opens itself to ideologies, adopts a simple friend-foe pattern in which success remains the only criterion for its action?

Luther knew of the responsibility of a government before God, he maintained the rôle of the Church as a watchman in the realm of the state and he urged individual Christians to participate actively in the life of the Church and of the state. He defined this responsibility in a functional way in the "orders" of religion, of economy and of politics. E. Wolf has shown how these three orders were separated and developed independently during the time of Lutheran orthodoxy. What held them together at last in 19th century liberalism was merely the "Christian personality" with his "inner freedom", with his attitude of love and his moral conscience. A direct claim of God's world became questionable which again went together with a spiritualized understanding of the Church. The state on the other hand received a place within the order of creation with immanent rationality (*Staatsrason*) and was furnished with an exclusive mandate of power and authority under which citizens as subjects were kept politically immature²⁾. It is here that that much criticized dualism between the two realms could develop. Of course, the concept of the two kingdoms remains helpful in the way which was outlined above as it serves to explain the selfcontradiction of the world with which it refuses to acknowledge the kingship of Christ. However, that antithesis of the world is *not dualistic* but rather *eschatological*.³⁾

On what grounds can we base our hope for the world? Are we too optimistic about a secularized world? There are today trends in social ethics which reject the distrust of reason and the general pessimism of the old anthropology. Man's creative ingenuity and responsibility is praised by which he builds the secular city as God's hidden co-worker. We cannot agree with such optimism.

Our hope cannot stem from any theological concept based on orders of creation or on an optimistic anthropology. Both will miss the real nature of the NT concept of hope. If we nevertheless do not want to regard the "realm to the left" only as the fallen creation in which a hidden God is at work, but also as the place in which Christian obedience can be realized, then we must give further proof for this claim.

V. The Kingship of Christ

Answers to our problem have been given by what is today called a "Theology of the Kingship of Christ", it has also been termed the "enlightened, utopic concept". This concept has raised the most penetrating criticism to any ethics based on orders of creation and their resignation with regard to the world.

The eschatological kingship of Christ, it is said, allows Christians to face the reality of the world in the light of the Christ-reality, and secondly, to understand their responsibility for the world of God as God's co-workers in the sense of I Cor. 3:9. They know of a pattern by which our actions can be framed, namely this: we live in a time of God's advent. The Kingdom is at hand, we have to give witness to its glory. Being in discipleship with Christ we are at the same time living in solidarity with the need of the created world. Thus our whole life is claimed and we enjoy the freedom from worldly bondage. This position can best be summed up with the second thesis of the famous "Barmen Declaration":

"As Jesus Christ is God's assurance of forgiveness of all our sins, so in the same way and with the same seriousness he is also God's mighty claim upon our whole life. Through him we receive the joyful deliverance from the godless fetters of this world for a free, grateful service to his creatures. We reject the false doctrine as though there were areas of our life

in which we would not belong to Jesus Christ, but to other lords, areas in which we would not need justification and sanctification through him."

How meaningful and comforting this sounds even for us in present South Africa! We see at once that it is not enough to describe the world as the dominion of the hidden God, as the world of creation and sin. In faith we know that the hidden God is the revealed God; but this knowledge must now be confessed openly and practically in a witness to the rule of Christ also over the dominion of the world. It must be said that in this "realm to the left" we are cooperating with God not only in preserving the world from chaos (by this even police state methods could be justified!), but we also have to care for its affairs positively in the light of the Easter event.

Of this world it is said, "He came to his own home, and his own people received him not." (John 1:11), but also, "The kingdom of the world has become the kingdom of our Lord and of his Christ" (Rev. 11:15).

This suggests to us that the Two Kingdom Doctrine has its legitimate place *within* the horizon of the kingship of Christ. Since God's justification is a transfer from one dominion into another, man is claimed totally in his faith and in his action. The kingship of Christ cannot, therefore, be seen in a docetic manner as a spiritual kingdom. Of course, it cannot either be a description of outward conditions in the world. But where the confession of Christ is made, there faith knows that the self-contradiction of the world has been overcome. Where God has reconciled the world, there Christ has become the hidden Lord over the world. This prompts us to deny that a Christian is a citizen of two kingdoms. He can be called a citizen of Christ's dominion only, one who is now free to act in the world as a witness. This means, so far as I can see, two things for us in South Africa.

A. No other dominions must be respected which could claim the Christian's obedience to that degree as Jesus Christ. From here cultures, colour, race, language lose their ideological glory. Where they lose their ultimate value they can once more be judged soberly and realistically as gifts but not as rights. Here heresies creep in when the "volk", the

tribe, nationalism and history — be it that of the Voortrekkers of Cecil Rhodes, of Chaka or of kgosi Sekhukune — are worshipped and glorified. Even the preservation of Bantu culture and Bantu education is a questionable pagan romanticism in an age of rapid social change, be it under the pretext of "indigenization" or in order to create an ideological basis for "Bantu homelands". Christians are to be realists. As such they are the real "patriots" even where they render a critical service. (It is time that the label of "enthusiasm" and of "utopia" is given back to the followers of "Apartheid" after they had boasted about their "realism" for many years.)

B. Where Jesus Christ is confessed, men in South Africa are freed from the fears of the powers of this age. Freedom from the demons of fear and prejudice cannot be taken too seriously. The kingship of Christ means for European Christians that the presence of other nationalities holds no terror. One can be freed from the fear of numbers, from the fear of black power, free from the fear of losing status and control (this terrible and hopelessly pagan alternative: either we and Apartheid or the law of the jungle; and: after us the deluge!). African Christians are freed from the fear of police and of "Robben Island", freed from the insecurities and anxieties of status-seekers who are in search for identity. In this connection it may be of interest that the demonic forces which many Africans still seek in the private sphere of witchcraft and enmity, have long shifted to the socio-political scene in South African cities. Too many still fight evil at the wrong place and with the wrong means. But even on the political frontier the demons are known and overcome among those who know the better charm.

Indian and Coloured Christians, equally, can be freed from frustrations and be given a new sense of importance and belonging. How can the knowledge about Christ being king do such great things? Although we are called the Church of the Word can we expect so much from mere proclamation? No, the abstract idea is of no avail as long as there is no chance given for *acts* of freedom, for practices of liberation from bondage. The Church is needed here as a testing-ground for freedom. Its leaders *can* encourage experiments,

they can be freed from the defence of the established order and from the fear of possible consequences at the hands of the government.

Coming from insights like these the question arises, whether we can propose any alternatives to the policy in force. More dialogue on this point is needed in our midst. We would however warn of thinking in terms of alternative, all-inclusive programs, of something serving as an ideological pendant to Separate Development. We must learn to think more pragmatic. Freedom must be fought for on the community level. The direction is that of a Civil Rights movement for South Africa which gradually tries to transform — not the state — but the society. This movement will in time lead to changes of policy, maybe in the direction of a qualified franchise for all and the abandonment of a good number of the existing Apartheid laws. Is such an evolutionary process still thinkable and possible in present day South Africa as a third way between acceptance of the status quo or open war? This needs to be explored to the fullest extent.

Have I as a theologian now replaced the Gospel with a political philosophy? No, I rather tried to find out the tendencies for orientation from the Kingship of Christ and I firmly believe that they can be made relevant for our specific situation.

VI. The Prophetic Witness of the Church

An understanding of the Two Kingdom Doctrine within the horizon of the kingship of Christ must include a perception of the witness of the congregation and of the Church as a whole.

It had always been held that the individual Christian's life and motives must come under the guidance of Christ. We have to add today that also the *conditions* in which men live, must come under the transforming influence of the Gospel. The scope of the diaconate widens from caritative work to include constructive co-operation in the fight for man's total welfare. The socio-political responsibility of the Church is not yet fulfilled where she urges individuals to act in the Christ-like way. The event of the kingship of Christ in the heart has consequences for politics in the proclamation of the Church. To her the socio-ethical admonitions of the Bible are direct-

ed. In service and witness she is Christ's agent to reach out into the world. This needs deeper thinking about what it means that in the midst of states, parties, nations and races of Africa there stands the Church of Christ. Her Lord had once made her a pioneer in South Africa and on the whole continent. Has she ceased to be in that pioneer-rôle? At this point our Church — more than anywhere else — has to reshape her outlook. We have once accepted the Church as an agent of mission to the heathen world. We must see how this mission today extends into the political and social world as more and more people are awakened to the problems of a fast-growing industrialized nation as ours.

Such guidance must speak of the world and of God's kingdom in such a way that the prophetic, anti-demonic criticism of the Gospel can be heard. Luther in his formulation of the concept of the two regiments could not possibly know the powers of modern secularism and its ideologies, like nationalism, secular humanism and Communism, which threaten the worldliness of the world by demonic structures of collective dimensions. Such criticism of worldly structures of states, societies and economies must in changing social and historical situations be formulated anew to counter the threats against the humanity of man . . . The Church is the advocate of the worldliness of the world and of the humanity of man. She thus challenges the domination of single races and classes . . . she stands against all old and new forms of social oppression. Thus she strives for the freedom of the personality, for social justice, for wordly peace among the nations, for human partnership between individuals and social groupings. Without such good works of love that serve all men the prophetic, anti-demonic criticism of the Church living in the modern world degenerates into a mere powerless theological theory. Prophetic proclamation of the Gospel, together with works of diaconate prevent the Church from becoming an end in itself. For her neither rulership nor tutelage over the world are permissible.

Such prophetic proclamation, lastly, points to the aspect of universality and eschatology without which the Two Kingdom Doctrine cannot be valid anymore. Any contrast between God's kingdom and the world is

temporary and transitory; it will once be outdated in the new world of God's new creation which has already entered into our midst. This is the view-point of the prophets. Our Church, therefore, needs to listen to the prophets as she is used to listen to the priests. The South African "world" may call them liberals, envoys of Communism, minority pressure-groups, humanists, utopic enthusiasts, universalists, enemies of the country and undesirable elements. The Church should listen more closely. She should not speak with Amaziah, the priest at Bethel who said, "O seer, go, flee way to the land of Judah, and eat bread there, and prophesy there; but never again prophesy at Bethel, for it is the king's sanctuary, and it is a temple of the kingdom." (Amos 7:12). The Church can know better that such men are sent for her sake, that the Church can remain a Church without being conformed to the pattern of the normal way of life of a country like South Africa.

VII. Christian decision-making in a pluralistic society

The theology of the Kingship of Christ whose motives we tried to confront with our present situation in this country tries to deduce practical advice from dogmatic insights. This has sometimes been done without a careful analysis of complex socio-political situations. In Germany such political engagement has however saved the Church from compromises with the ruling ideology of the state. In the years following the war this theology helped once more to prevent an easy integration and identification with the thought-patterns of the cold war between east and west. It could very well render this service to us in South Africa in warning us of easy identifications with either Afrikaner nationalism or African nationalism. With all its stress on a social and political witness this theology raises the awareness among Christians that they are "the third generation", especially where such theology takes serious the aspect of universalism and of eschatology. This would be welcomed especially where its representatives reveal maturity and democratic common sense as they have done in the past.

The Two Kingdom theologians on the other side have always tried to include a reasoning about facts and

political calculation into their ethical reflections. This led however to static interpretation of "orders" and too often confirmed the existing conditions.

For both approaches ethical behaviour is an attempt to confront the demands of the situation with Christian "norms". But what can be done if, embarrassingly, the answers contradict each other (like pro-Apartheid/anti-Apartheid)? This is typical for decision-making of Christians in a pluralistic society. If that is so then we have to re-formulate our approach. This is especially felt with the Two Kingdom Doctrine. Decisions for South Africa depend on so many complex factors, that the scheme of "orders" just does not fit anymore, as it reveals authoritarian or legalistic thinking. Some have suggested that in decision-making so-called "middle axioms" like that of the "responsible society" be included. Luther saw the state merely as an institution that controls outwardly sin and chaos. This idea can hardly be adjusted to modern democracies. Consequently democracy has since remained an unsolved problem in Lutheran social ethics (so W. Trillhaas).

VIII. Christian Social Ethics in an age of Revolution

We come to our last point of a critical encounter with the Two Kingdom Doctrine. This chapter leads us back to the themes discussed at the 1966 conference of Church and Society.

The Christian faith has grown in societies with stable and static orders. Often these orders were regarded as orders of creation. Coming from this background Christians have usually been anti-revolutionary, that is revolutionary changes have to them appeared as sin and violation of God's will, smelling of chaos and destruction. Undoubtedly the Two Kingdom Doctrine belongs into this tradition.

Even in Africa the Gospel was first planted in established tribal societies. The scene has changed today as Africa has become a continent marked by rapid social change in which often development is only possible with the use of force. Moreover, a privileged minority class of people uses force daily in order to maintain its status by oppression. How do Christians then look at revolution? God is not a principle of

order nor of permanent social change. Revolutionary processes are not directly God's will, neither can they be ruled out by a theological norm. God remains the Lord of history.

We live from the certainty that God's Kingdom comes. In Christ we are offered salvation and reconciliation which is proclaimed and shown to the world in Christian action of peace-making and of brotherly service. In this way the Gospel is in itself revolutionary beyond control, as under its impact the world cannot remain what it is.

Christians must not leave this view to the enthusiasts or to the Marxists. They are themselves qualified for such responsibility since they have stopped to cling to ideologies and do not believe in political and social programs that are made absolute. They can form fellowships of reconciliation, they can protest against injustices, they can live in solidarity with those who suffer, they can confess guilt which in itself is a revolution, they can even stand in solidarity with those who think they have to participate in acts of revolution where there is no other way. In

doing so, they are not advocating permanent change, though, but strive for the better society, for the time being, and at the place where they are. There is a time for rest and a time for departure. There is the time in which an existing order has to be defended with all might, we cannot advocate a theology of perpetual crisis. There is time for praise of the establishment, there is another time for Exodus and change. But even then Christians know that the new heaven and the new earth are God's work. But it is this very knowledge which can make the Church to become an "exodus-congregation" if this is needed. Christians are allowed to sometimes be the torch-bearers in front and not always those who form the rear-guard of progress. This can be all the more so since their hope is not only kindled by God's future but also by what God has done on Easter morning.

The resurrection is the most radical break-through from a hopeless order of the world. It is the revolution before all revolutions. Where in death the world has come to its limits, there the crucified and risen one goes on, there faith can and must become hope. Such hope "provokes

and produces a thinking in anticipation, an imagination of love how it could go better in the world and more just among men; for this hope has the certainty that the ultimate best and the justice of God are coming."⁴

After what I have said in the introduction of this paper, I need not specify the relevance of this new thinking for South Africa and for our Churches. Who has ears, let him hear. What I intended was to lead into a discussion which does not stop with the Two Kingdom Doctrine but rather takes its start in the dialogue from this tradition. May God help his South African Christians to pronounce their witness for a spiritual and political renewal of our country.

* This is the slightly abridged form of an address to Lutheran Church leaders presented at Rustenburg in April 1968.

- 1) H. Bornkamm, *Luther's Doctrine of the Two Kingdoms*. Philadelphia 1966, p. 33.
- 2) *Zur Selbstkritik des Luthertums*, in *Peregrinatio II*, München 1965, p. 97 ff.
- 3) E. Wolf, *Königsherrschaft Christi und Zweireichelehre*, ibidem, p. 222.
- 4) J. Moltmann, *Theologie der Hoffnung*, 3rd ed. München 1964, p. 334.

ALLES TEVERGEEFS... OF ALLES NUUT?

— DR. B. J. VAN DER MERWE †

(Oujaarspreek na aanleiding van Prediker 3:15 en II Kor. 5:17, gelewer in die St. Andrew's Presbiteriaanse Kerk, Pretoria, 31 Desember 1967. Die aanvangswoorde: „In hierdie laaste uur van die jaar 1967 . . .” is deur mev. Van der Merwe gewysig met die oog op die tydstip waarop ons dit plaas).

In hierdie laaste dae van die jaar 1968 neem ek u in gedagte terug na die laaste jare van die derde eeu v.C., sê maar so tussen 225-200 v.C. Erens in een van die stede van die vergriekste wêreld van daardie tyd — miskien in Alexandrië — sit daar 'n ou man en skrywe, 'n waardige figuur, ook aan sy uiterlike herkenbaar as 'n wyse van daardie tyd. Die boek wat hy daar met sy rietpen op die een papyrusblad na die ander sit en skrywe, ken ons almal as die boek **Prediker**.

Beheersd en ingehoue, ewewigtig en met groot versigtigheid sit die ou wysgeer sy ondervindings en gevolgtrekkings, sy beskouing en lewenservaring en opskrywe. Soos 'n film gaan sy wêreld en sy lewe, die geskiedenis van sy jare voor hom verby. Hy noem egter geen name of datums nie, omdat hy in sy siel daarvan oortuig is dat wat hy neerskryf nie net sy ervaring is en nie net 'n oorsig oor sy tyd nie, maar almal se

ervaring en 'n oorsig oor alle tye: die een geslag gaan en die ander geslag kom en die aarde bly vir ewig staan; wat gewees het, dit sal weer wees en wat gebeur het, dit sal daar weer gebeur en daar is glad niks nuuts onder die son nie.

Wat hy daar skryf is eintlik die „lewensbieg van 'n teleurgestelde”. Hieruit moet ons egter nie aflei dat sy lewe 'n aaneenskakeling van rampe en teenspoed was nie — intendeel,

sy lewe was vol, eintlik oorvol. Daar is niks onder die son wat hy nie geniet het nie. Blykbaar het hy ook nie 'n gebrek aan geld of goed gehad nie, ook nie aan gesondheid en lewenskrag nie. Hy is ook nie 'n goddelose nie; hy erken die bestaan van God en die bestuur van alles deur God: „Ek het ingesien dat alles wat God doen vir ewig sal bestaan, daar kan niks bygevoeg word en daar kan niks van wegeneem word nie — en God het dit so gemaak dat hulle moet vrees voor sy aangesig.”

GODSPLAN?

In die wêreld en lewe rondom hom sien hy die verloop van 'n ewige godsplan. Maar die sin en betekenis van hierdie godsplan is vir hom onduidelik en onbegrypbaar en die mens kan ook geen medewerker van hierdie godsplan wees nie. Die mens kan slegs in berusting onder hierdie plan buig. Hierdie godsplan hang ver bo

die mens en die wêreld het eintlik geen invloed op die gang van die daaglikse lewe nie. Prediker merk in elk geval bloedweinig daarvan in die gang van die daaglikse lewe. Rondom hom sien hy 'n wêreld en lewe vol wisselende lotgevalle — eintlik 'n bese wêreld waarin die hoogste in die diepte sink en die laagste na bo opborrel. 'n Tyd vol verdrukking en onreg en tirannie, vol onsekerheid oor die bestaan, 'n tyd waarin die dwaasheid botvier — 'n tyd waarin geluksoekers en fortuinmakers aan die roer van sake staan; 'n tyd waarin die godsdienste van oos en wes vermeng is tot 'n skynvroomheid, wat deur niemand ernstig opgeneem word nie en wat hoogstens 'n dekmantel geword het van menslike hoogmoed en cie wil. 'n Tyd waarin geslepe vroue en vleiers die politiek beheers, waarin bloedige gruweldade aan die orde van die dag is, waarin die dolle jag na singenot en goedkoop roem die magwoord geword het van almal wat wil presteer.

Daarom kan die gryse prediker ook geen vrede met die kerkleer van sy tyd, nl. dat God die slegte straf en die goeies beloon, vind nie. Want hy het met sy oë gesien dat die regverdige verdruk word en dat die goddelose seëvier.

Broeders en susters, u voel dat hierdie man ons broer is in murg en been. Sy prediking is iets wat ons verstaan. Sy tyd is ons tyd; sy ervaring is ons ervaring. Daarom is die boek Prediker eintlik in wese 'n „Oujaarsboek”. 'n Boek waarin 'n mens, ons broer, die wel en weë optel en aftrek en tot die teleurstellende slotsom kom: alles tevergeefs! Alles is ydelheid. Die enigste verstandige lewenshouding is: om die weinig goed wat daar nog te vinde is te geniet en om jou werk te doen sonder om te vra na die sin of bevrediging daarvan.

„Gewis is alles net 'n grap!
Ons speel in die komedie mee
geblinddoek met 'n lanferlap
wat selfs die son 'n skadu gee.”
(Eugène Marais)

KRINGLOOP

Die diepste tragiek van hierdie boek is dat dit geen toekomsverwagting het nie. Dit kom baie mooi uit in Prediker 3:1-15. Alles het sy bepaalde tyd en vir elke saak onder die hemel is daar 'n bepaalde uur. In sewe (die allesomvattende heilige getal) dubbele teenstellings word al die aktiwiteite en gebeurtenisse van mense

en volke saamgevat: gebore word en sterwe, ween en lag; soek en verlore laat gaan; swyg en spreek; oorlog en vrede — al hierdie dinge word eindeloos herhaal. Daar is miskien 'n sekere bekoring in hierdie dinge, as die een die ander volg; daar is 'n sekere plan in merkbaar. In wese is dit egter 'n lot — 'n bange lot waarin die mens vasgevang sit, waaraan hy niks kan verander nie.

Broeders en susters, en as ons nou ons harte peil dan is dit so min of meer die inhoud van ons oujaarsmymeringe: wanneer ons al die ander emosies, wat met die jaarwisseling gepaard gaan, opstoot, dan bly daar slegs die onvermydelikheid van die voortgang van die tyd oor. Of ons wil of nie, 'n jaar is onherroepelik verby. Dit leef in ons herinnering, maar dit is verby. Ons kan telkens weer by die mylpale daarvan stilstaan — maar dit bly vergange.

En nou sê ons teksvers uit Prediker 3:15 — „en God soek weer op wat verbygegaan het.” Wat beteken dit? Beteken dit dat God ook magteloos staan teenoor die verlede? Dat Hy die dinge en tyd wat verby is weer deurblaai soos 'n boek, weer laat herlewe, soos 'n film? Dit sou 'n vreeslike oordeel oor ons wees, want dit sou beteken dat ons nooit van die ou, die verbygegane, loskom nie. As eendag, in die laaste oordeel, die „boeke geopen word” dan kom geheel ons lewe terug, ook die lewe van die afgelope jaar — tot 'n oordeel. Hierdie verklaring lyk op die oog af baie aanneemlik. Ons hou daarvan om oor God te dink in terme van onself. Ons mense vind dikwels niks so aangenaam as om „in die verlede” van 'n ander te delf en al wat vuil en naar en absurd daarin is in herinnering te roep nie.

Intussen bedoel Prediker dit egter nie — wat hy wel bedoel is dat die ewige kringloop, wat hy in hierdie sewe dubbele teenstellings beskrywe het, 'n werk van God is. Dat God telkens weer die verlede in die hede laat herlewe. En dit is net so erg. Dit beteken immers dat ons in die nuwe jaar ingaan met die wete dat ons die skuld van die oue saamdra, dat die verlede vir ons 'n eindelose verskrikking bly, dat ons geen uitsig of verwagting in die nuwe het nie.

Hierdie opvatting van Prediker hang saam met sy Godsbegrip: God is vir Hom die verre en vreemde, die onbegryplike. Hy word wel nie 'n

goddelose nie. Hy spoor selfs aan om nougeset te wees in die vervulling van die godsdienstige verpligtings „Want God is in die hemel en jy op aarde”. Die geloof in God bied egter vir hom weinig troos.

Daarom kan hy daartoe kom om die tevergeefsheid, die ydelheid, die onvermydelikheid van die lewe aan God toe te skryf: God soek weer op wat verbygegaan het.

NUWE BEGIN

Daarom stel die boek Prediker en hierdie prediking in die laaste deel van die jaar ons voor die vraag na ons verhouding tot God. Wat beteken die geloof in God in u lewe? Wat het u geloof in God in die afgelope jaar vir u beteken? Die antwoord op hierdie vraag bepaal ons gevoel oor die jaar wat verby is en ons verwagting vir die jaar wat op die drumpel is.

God soek weer op wat verbygegaan het — God is deel van hierdie eindelose herhaling; óf God het Homself daaraan onttrek. So besluit die wysgeer — en so glo ons!

Intussen is daar rondom ons en prediker 'n wolk van getuies wat as met duisend stemme **anders** van God getuig: Hy is nie die verre vreemde, vasgevang in die web wat Hyself gespin het nie — Hy is Skepper en Herskepper van alle dinge. „Die ou dinge het verbygegaan, kyk, dit het alles nuut geword”.

Dit is seker nie altyd so goed dat Kersfees en Nuwejaar so dig bymekaar val nie. Baie van die wêreldse uitspattigheid van Nuwejaar is op Kersfees oorgedra. Tog, is dit ook goed: as ons almanak sê dis oujaar en die horlosie die laaste minute aftik — dan mag die gemeente van Jesus Christus weet: dit is lankal nie meer oujaar nie — God het lankal 'n nuwe begin gemaak, op Kersfees, in Jesus Christus. God is nie die verre vreemde nie, Hy is God Immanuel — God met ons. God is nie die een wat eindeloos ons skuld en sonde in herinnering roep nie, maar Hy is die een wat ons met Homself versoen het deur Jesus Christus. Die wisseling van die tye word nie deur die almanak aangedui of deur die horlosie afgetik nie, maar is eens en vir altyd bepaal deur Jesus Christus. God is nie vasgevang in die wisseling van die tye nie. Hy is die God en Vader van onse Here Jesus Christus, wat om Christus ontwil ook die sonde en ellende van 1968 wil vergewe; wat ons NUUT wil maak.

Gospel or Ideology in South Africa?

WHO IS LORD IN SOUTH AFRICA?

Is this the key question in South Africa, or is it irrelevant? *Wie is die baas in Suid-Afrika*—die egte baas, die groot-baas? Is dit werklik die politieke leiers en die kabinet, of is dit Christus? Is dit nie die sentrale vraag waarop ons moet antwoord nie? Can a great political strong man, 'n volksleier, a political system, be lord in South Africa? Surely this is the relevant question which both December 16 and the gospel of Jesus thrusts before the nation?

To the vast majority of South Africans this may seem an irrelevant question — simply because one does not raise questions to which the answers are obvious. Almost all Christians would have no hesitation in affirming that the answer is that Jesus is Lord! However, what makes that affirmation profoundly hypocritical and spurious is the vast gap that exists between what we preach and what we practise in South Africa. Not that we don't make efforts to bridge that gap — its just that our efforts are so limited by self-interest that our confession remains a mockery!

This shattering conclusion is inescapable when one faces the facts. It then becomes obvious that *the vast majority of South African Christians, of all races, actually live in obedience to the dictates of apartheid*. We do so either because we believe in the system or because we are *forced to* submit to it anyway. This means that no matter what we confess on Sundays, or in our bold resolutions and public statements, we have in fact rejected the lordship of Jesus. Our confession of Jesus as Lord, is almost entirely theoretical and "religious" — and thus irrelevant. It is not couched in the daily structure of our lives — for our socio-cultural style of live is entirely determined by the system of apartheid and not by our Christian principles. Such is the intensity of our mass hypocrisy.

It seems that this disastrous process has become established over the past twenty years because of our self-interest, racial prejudice and fear. It has been institutionalized as the system of separate development, and our concern is that it has now been absolutised as a doctrine. To believe in it is to have "life". To doubt it or reject it is to forfeit "life". This is heresy. For this reason we have tried to show how the doctrine and its offer of salvation is rejected

by the gospel as fake. We exposed the two principles on which it is based, racial identity and racial separation, as being anti-Christian. We are now bound to demonstrate how the ideology is finally rejected because it has been set up, and is implemented, as an absolute doctrine. As such it stands in direct conflict with a basic essential of the Christian faith and the lordship of Christ.

This essential is the belief in the sovereignty of God and His rule on earth. Christians believe that God's sovereignty transcends over all authorities and powers of the world. It reigns supreme and it limits man's power which is subject to Him. *Yahweh, the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, is "Baas" — and also in South Africa*. This sovereignty, whether acknowledged or not, is also the ultimate basis for the right and duty of every man to claim for himself and his neighbours the kind of freedom which is fundamental to the dignity of man. Finally, this essential also emphasises our need to be aware of another Christian doctrine, the sinfulness of man. It therefore warns against a political system which allows anyone to have arbitrary, unchecked power over others. Reinhold Niebuhr stated it well in his famous epigram:

Man's capacity for justice makes democracy possible; but man's inclination to injustice makes democracy necessary⁹

Hence political systems such as those of Diem (S. Vietnam), Nkrumah (Ghana) and Breshnev (Russia), have clearly usurped that sovereignty which belongs to God alone. They have done so particularly by assuming extensive arbitrary powers over others, and it is now clear that in our own fatherland the Nationalist regime has done the same. It has absolutised its power. It has practically set itself up as omnipotent and omnipresent. It has gone a long way in making itself omniscient. In

— THE REV. JAMES A. POLLEY

short, it has occupied God's domain and challenged His rule! However, if this deliberate process of rebellion against God (of which we are all part), is not obvious, we wish to illuminate it by examining some of the legislation that got it off the ground.

I. The State Usurping the Sovereignty of God

We believe that the facts which follow substantiate the indictment that the state has practically set itself up as God in South Africa. It has enthroned itself as *the Absolute*. It operates as the final authority in all our lives. However, we must be clear that our quarrel is not with the State because it exercises power in South Africa, but because it has absolutised its power, and has done this *by way of usurping the authority of the courts and by transferring this power into the hands of an individual Cabinet Minister or the State President*. The following acts of legislation provide some insight into the system of self-deification.

The Suppression of Communism Act, No. 44, of 1950 gave the State President the power to ban any person, periodical, organisation or gathering which, *in his opinion*, was furthering the objects of Communism as defined by the Act. Amendments in 1954, 1965, 1966 and 1967 gave the minister even wider powers. On 3 February, 1967 the Minister reported in the Assembly that 675 persons had been banned by the end of 1966. By the end of 1967 the number had increased to 698, Ian Robertson and Dr. R. Hoffenberg being amongst them²⁰. Whilst it is quite likely that many of these people, like Ian Robertson had committed no offence whatsoever, their freedom was mercilessly destroyed in this way, simply because they were *the kind of people the State disliked*.

One wonders how many other innocent people have suffered like this? Unfortunately we will never know the answer to that question because banned persons have *no recourse to the courts*. However, in each case *the minister alone* has taken power to exercise a judgement which has limited hundreds of people to half a

life, and many others to a mere existence, without any obligation to explain or justify his decision. That sort of action is clearly condemned by every page of the Bible which speaks of justice.

In 1955 insult was added to injury. Like a new born African state emerging from the cocoon of its own revolution the government became over sensitive to every little disturbance in its environment. It regarded real opposition as an offence and strong criticism as a crime. The Departure from the Union Regulation Act of that year provided the Minister of the Interior with the power to withhold or withdraw any person's passport. It was made clear (unlike the situation in any other Western democracy) that a passport was a privilege and not a right. In this way the minister assumed the power to destroy a citizen's basic right to freedom of movement and travel abroad. By doing this the State denied individuals their legal right of access into other parts of the world. The State in fact assumed the authority to shut off the rest of the world from every individual they did not favour.

This sort of decision has been applied to 894 persons over the four year period, 1963 to 1966³⁾. It has been used as a means of political intimidation and harassment, seriously penalising innocent and respectable South African citizens for the sake of the ideology's public relations. For what the State fears most is that men of the stature and ability of Alan Paton, Knowledge Guzana, Athol Fugard and Bishop Zulu might tell the outside world the truth about apartheid. Others the State have acted against in this way, because they fear their moral integrity, are the Rev. Simon Gcubule and the Rev. Basil Moore of the Methodist Church; Rev. Ian Thompson of the Presbyterian Church; Stephen Hayes of the Anglican Church; Mr. Laurence Gandar, Mr. John Daniel, Mr. Duncan Innes and many others.

However, not only individuals but also organisations were dealt with in this same authoritarian way, with no explanations given and of course no recourse to the courts. In 1960 the Unlawful Organisations Act provided the State President with the power to declare organisations unlawful. The A.N.C., the P.A.C., and even the Defence and Aid Fund became victims of this Act. However, the absolutising of power became

much more subtle as it reached deeply into the very soul of our people. The General Law Amendment Act, No. 76, of 1962, is a good example. It enabled the State President to ban any organisation which *he thought* was advancing the interests "either directly or indirectly", of an already banned organization. It further extended his power by giving him the right

- (i) to ban persons from specified gatherings which do not have a common purpose, such as social gatherings;
- (ii) to impose various restrictions on the movements of people *whom he considers* to be promoting the objectives of communism, or are engaging in activities which may do so.

It is under this provision that the Rev. Herbert Lovemore of the Walmer Methodist Church was banned from attending social or political gatherings simply because he occasionally engaged in the innocent Christian activity of providing food and clothing, etc. to the families of political prisoners in Port Elizabeth.

- (iii) to impose "house arrest".
- (iv) to prohibit the assembly of any gathering or type of gathering or persons involved, in order to combat Communism.
- (v) under previous legislation the State President could only ban an organisation after an investigation by a person designated by the minister, had taken place. This provision was deleted. The President's power was absolutised and not even the Supreme Court could challenge it.

It is significant that the International Commission of Jurists maintained that the Act reduced the liberty of the citizen to a degree not surpassed by the most extreme dictatorship of the Left or Right — and that it was not worthy of a civilized jurisprudence (The Star, June 21st., 1962).

An Amendment, No. 37 of 1963, provided the Minister with the power to extend the imprisonment of a prisoner for a period of twelve months *if he is satisfied* that such a person, after his release, is likely to further the achievement of any of the objects of Communism. The period can also be renewed. Mr. Robert Sobukwe, a Methodist local preacher, and leader of the P.A.C. had his imprisonment so extended. The period was renewed again in

May this year as he commenced his sixth year of detention under the Act! This is surely one of the most infamous Acts in civilized history!

However, the most notorious section was the dreadful "90 day" clause in Section 17. On 29 January, 1965 the Minister of Justice indicated that 1095 people had been detained under this clause since its inception in 1963. Of those detained, 575 persons were charged with specific offences. Only 272 of them were convicted: 210 were discharged whilst 93 were still awaiting trial at the time of this report. That means that about 520 detainees were released without being charged. Of that group 241 gave evidence for the State. This means that the 279 persons released without trial and the 210 who were discharged were perfectly innocent citizens. However, having been detained these 489 people had to face severe social ostracism, suspicion, broken relationships and careers in society as the direct consequence of the Minister's decision and delegated powers. (Cf. Survey 1965, p. 54). This clause was replaced after its withdrawal in 1965, by the "180 day" clause of the Criminal Procedure Amendment Act, No. 96, of 1965. It gave *the attorney-general* the power to issue a warrant for the arrest of any person necessary for a trial — even so as to give possible information or evidence for the State. On 23 May, 1967, the Minister reported that over 300 persons had been detained in this way to date. As in the case of the "90 day" clause suicides were an inevitable consequence. He reported 3 cases of suicide after 2, 16 and 37 days of detention⁴⁾.

The above evidence is but a *sample*, we stress, of that process whereby the State has enthroned itself and absolutised its power. We now turn to an examination of the consequences of these high handed actions.

II. The Subjugation of Man to its political system

We begin by noting that the methodology used here has been the suspension of the rule of law (as well illustrated in the previous section). The International Commission of Jurists has recently published a book entitled "The Erosion of the Rule of Law in South Africa" in which they document this process. The second part of the book contains Professor Richard A. Falk's report on the terrorism trial of South West Africans

held in Pretoria. As the Commission's official observer he noted that "the trial and the expectation of additional so-called terrorist trials appears to be part of an over-all drift towards totalitarianism. The role of the Special Branch in staging the trial is especially ominous in this regard." It is therefore no exaggeration to say that the law, once such a bastion of justice in South Africa, has been reduced to a perpetually changing instrument in the hand of a ruling minority prepared to go to any length to maintain its supremacy. Hence Professor Julius Lewin, an advocate and retired Prof. of African Law and Administration at Wits. university, pointed out as early as 1960 that:-

A heavy part of the cost (of apartheid) is the increasing suspension of the rule of law . . . A government determined at all costs to enforce apartheid in the teeth of all legal or practical difficulties will abandon the rule of law itself⁵.

Lewin's diagnosis has been amply confirmed over the past eight years as the State proceeded to totally subjugate its citizens to a rigid legal-political system. By means of its arbitrary power it elevated the system of separate development to a level of primary importance and authority. It gradually absolutised the system just as it had absolutised its own power — until it became a complete superstructure for South African society. *At the same time it subjugated man to a level of secondary importance. He was forced to fit the system, and where he would not bend to do so (or bend far enough), he was broken — even discarded as unnecessary and expendable! There is surely no more shocking indictment of any political system than this — that it gives priority to systems over people; that it dehumanizes its citizens by depriving them of their human dignity and stripping them of their civil liberties; that it reduces man to a sub-human; a mere pawn in the game the government is playing (and always on a black and white board)! However, we need to document some of the facts for the sake of those who are not aware of this process of depersonalization, as it tears its way through the lives of ordinary people.*

We begin by noting the experience of the hundreds who are banned, who have had passports refused or confiscated, who are or have been

held in detention and under house arrest; the tens of thousands who have suffered and still suffer due to being moved by the Group Areas Act; the hundreds in prison because they belonged to their own (but banned) political organisations etc. etc. To this great stream of persecuted human beings we must add thousands more. At the outset these are the majority of Africans who have had their freedom of movement and association ended by the Native Laws Amendment Act of 1949, the Amendment to it in 1952, and the Urban Areas Act of 1956. These Acts introduced the system of the labour bureaux, not being able to seek work without permission and the 72 hour limit in urban areas. It is also under these laws that tens of thousands have been "endorsed out" of urban areas.

On 12 August, 1966, the Minister indicated in the Assembly that in 1965 alone at least, 86,186 people had been endorsed out (latest available figures)⁶. Most of these people are moved into resettlement villages or the homelands. There are reportedly 24 such resettlement villages, all of them intensive pockets of poverty and hopelessness. Sada in the Whittlesea district is an example of such depressing dehumanization. The Minister reported in the Assembly on 17 February, 1967 that there were 28,121 Africans in the area of whom only 81 had employment⁷.

We must also add the terrible toll taken by the system of migratory labour. Many organisations, including the Dutch Reformed Church, have protested against this inhuman process of economic development. One example will suffice to make the point again. The Athlone Advice office of the Black Sash reported on 30 September, 1967, that of the 33,300 Africans in Langa then, some 24,550 were so-called bachelor migrant labourers. However, 69% of them were in fact married and this separation from their wives and families can only have severely destructive personal and social consequences. The same sort of position holds in all our urban areas.

The Bantu Laws Amendment Act, No. 76 of 1963 augmented and reinforced measures for the control of the presence and employment of all Africans in White South Africa. Another Amendment in 1964 (No. 42) finally deprived the African of whatever dignity had been left him

as a man. An examination of the Act reveals that there actually isn't much else of a man's life that could be dominated. The Act covers it all — movement, re-entry, seeking work, family, etc. (Cf. Survey 1964, pp. 174-185).

Mr. G. F. L. Froneman, M.P., now a Deputy Minister, sums up this process we are documenting in his statement to the Assembly on 6 May 1965, concerning Africans in urban areas:

. . . *(the Bantu) are only supplying a commodity, the commodity of labour . . . It is labour we are importing and not labourers as individuals . . . (Hansard, 14, Col. 5460.)*

Another factor in the process, which also accurately reflects it, is the pass laws. The Report of the Commissioner of the South African Police stated that 479,114 cases were sent for trial under the pass laws for the year ended 30 June, 1966. This amounts to an average of 1313 people per day, or 26.3% of the total number of prosecutions for all offences. We know that this annual average is always over 1000 persons per day⁸.

The Black Sash, in its Memorandum on the Application of the Pass Laws and Influx Control summed up out of first-hand experience:-

For thousands of Africans these laws result in broken families, in unemployment, in poverty, and malnutrition, insecurity and instability, and in a state of hopelessness . . . Millions of rands are spent in administering these laws, and millions of man-hours are wasted in the attempt to enforce unenforceable laws. The real cost must be counted in terms of human sorrow, bitterness, suffering and tragedy on a vast scale.

One of the most crucial factors, but not always directly related to the State, is the question of extensive economic exploitation of non-white labour by means of low wages, the ban on African trade unions and the system of job reservation. An examination of the long-term implications of these factors would prove to be as disturbing as anything else we have done research on in this study. It is undoubtedly a key factor!

Finally, we note that about 156 people have been *banished* since 1948; that in January, 1967, there were 1221 "political prisoners" in our goals, and that there had been as many as 1825 according to the

minister⁹⁾. There is also the usual annual crop of convictions against policemen and prison staff for various forms of assault and brutality¹⁰⁾. The crowning factor in the entire process is the strict prohibition on the individual's right to express his dissent, to protest even within the law — without a permit. The Criminal Law Amendment Act No. 8 of 1953, makes any such attempt or such campaign a serious offence! The General Law Amendment Act, No. 76 of 1962 dispenses with it as sabotage!

This is something of the dehumanizing process maintained by our government. It is a shocking conclusion to reach — that we live in what is in effect a totalitarian police state. A state that has over-reached its legitimate authority and usurped the authority of God. We, however, would not suggest that there has been no reason at all for some of the measures taken. There has been lawlessness in our country, but the law could have dealt with it. Justice could have been done openly and impartially. For nothing can justify the State usurping the sovereignty of God and subjugating man to its absolutised political system. Yet this is precisely what it has done and this is why the ideology of apartheid must be rejected.

However, there is one more way of illustrating the point we have tried to make. The Rev. Dr. J. D. Vorster, Chairman of Antikom, is of great assistance here. His organisation has pointed out quite correctly that Christianity conflicts with Communism on two basic points:— firstly, the Christian faith regards the elevation of the State to an Absolute as an attempt to usurp the sovereignty of God; secondly, the Christian concept of man is inconsistent with the subjugation of man to a political system. Man does not exist for the State, but the State exists for man.

We are obliged to inform Dr. Vorster that Christianity also conflicts with the apartheid system on the same grounds; for just like "Communism" the apartheid system rests squarely on these two bases. It is quite clear from the evidence in this paper that the South African government, like the Russian government, has elevated the State to an Absolute, and has ruthlessly subjugated its citizens to its political system. In this way both regimes differ radically from west-

ern democracies. Indeed, Mr. Philip Mason, President of the African-American Institute may be nearer the truth when he argues that South Africa is even more Stalinist in some ways than the Iron Curtain countries. He writes:

It would not be easy to judge whether the right to security of person . . . is respected any more or any less in South Africa than in one of the Iron Curtain countries. But equality before the law, freedom of movement, freedom to marry, are clearly much less evident in South Africa. Catholics in Poland may not have the right to educate their children as they want, but they are not debarred from living with their wives and children in large areas of the country, nor forced if they lose a job to give up their houses and move to some remote part of the country. They are not confronted with benches on which they may not sit and vehicles in which they may not travel. They are not sent to segregated schools and forbidden to marry outside their community. — (Foreign Affairs, Vol. 43, 1964-1965, p. 129.)

However, we would like to press the parallel one step further to establish the case. Both the Russian and South African government's narrow authoritarianism is visibly evident in their attitude to their satellite states. The opposition of both governments to economic and political reforms in Czechoslovakia and the Transkei respectively, is identical. Furthermore it is quite clear that if the Transkei did institute reforms such as inviting White capital and foreign aid, and ultimately declared U.D.I., we would have another Prague on our hands. The South African government we could predict, would act precisely as Kosygin and Breshnev did — the South African army would occupy Umtata and the rest of the country within hours, and by force if necessary.

For these reasons we know that our government and the Russian regime fall into the same category. They will appear as odd bed-fellows to Dr. Vorster, the cabinet and others, but they do in fact wear the same pyjamas. They may differ about which label to have on the door, but there is virtually no difference in their "behind-the-door" activities! We are therefore left with no alternative. If we are in agree-

ment about Christians resisting attempts by the State to usurp the sovereignty of God and the humanity of man in Communist countries, then it is also our solemn duty to do the same in our fatherland and to begin by sweeping our own doorstep. For rebellion against God is rebellion against God, no matter under what label it occurs!

However, our most serious problem is that of beginning to do what allegiance to Christ as Lord involves. The first obligation laid upon us is to distinguish between the system which is rejected and expendable, and its architects who are claimed by Christ as His own. The second is to recognize what is good in the system and to support it — and there is much which is good. The third is to select the point at which the lords of apartheid can be confronted with all that is evil in their system; to initiate dialogue with them and seek to convince them that the gospel of Christ *demand*s the dismantling of the entire godless structure — so that reconciliation is possible.

We note that the Prime Minister has warned us not to try to do what Dr. M. L. King did in America. We wish to assure him that it is not Martin Luther King but Jesus Christ whom we intend to imitate (and obey). We would welcome suggestions for dialogue but we wish to respectfully remind him that he and each of us must first answer a crucial question before we act in any way. That question is: *Wie is die egte Baas in Suid-Afrika? Or as Jesus put it: Who do you say that I am? (Mark. 8:29).*

- 1) *The Children of Light and the Children of Darkness* (Scribners 1944), p xi.
- 2) *A Survey of Race Relations in South Africa*, 1967, p. 39.
- 3) *Ibid*, 1964-1967.
- 4) *Ibid*, 1967, p. 53.
- 5) *Politics and Law in South Africa*, 1963, p. 11.
- 6) *Survey of Race Relations*, 1966, p. 162.
- 7) *Ibid*, 1967, p. 178.
- 8) *Ibid*, 1967, p. 71.
- 9) *Ibid*, 1967, p. 51.
- 10) *Ibid*, 1965, p. 82.
- 11) *Ibid*, 1964, p. 174 f.

DIE KERK BUITE SUID-AFRIKA

— PROF. B. B. KEET

TWEE BELANGRIKE UITSPRAKE OOR APARTHEID

"Oh, wad some power the giftic gie us, to see ourselves as others see us."

(Robert Burns, vry aangehaal)

Aan hierdie versugting van die digter het ek gedink toe ek die uitsprake van twee belangrike liggame oor Suid-Afrika en sy apartheidbeleid onder oë gekry het. Die eerste was van die Vierde Vergadering van die Kommissie van die Kerke oor Internasionale Sake, gehou te Kungälv, Swede, 24-28 Junie 1968; en die tweede was die verklaring van die Christian Reformed Church oor rasse-aangeleenthede, 25 Junie, Paul G. Schrottenboer, algemene sekretaris (Grand Rapids, Michigan).

I. Algemeen. Die Kommissie wil volle erkenning laat geskied aan wat in Suid-Afrika gedoen word, officieel en onoffisieel, vir die welsyn van die nie-blanke volke, asook vir die poging wat aangewend word om beter menslike verhoudinge tot stand te bring; maar dit is diep te betreur dat sulke toenaderinge met rassediskriminasie gepaard gaan, verskerp deur wetgewing wat volgens die opvatting van die Kommissie, in stryd is met Christelike beginsels en menslike waardigheid.

Om sulke spanninge te verlig, beveel die Kommissie sterk aan:

(1) Dat ernstige pogings aangewend word om aan die Suid-Afrikaanse kerke en die politieke outoriteite die eventuele rampspoedige gevolge tuis te bring, wat die teenswoordige beleid en praktyk met betrekking tot ras, op beide blank en nie-blank in Suid-Afrika moet hê. Die kerke moet insonderheid attent gemaak word op die kwade gevolge wat hierdie beleid en praktyk op die sendingwerk van die kerk en op die aanvaarding van die Christelike geloof deur die Afrikaner het. Dit is gebiedend noodsaaklik dat die uitdrukking van kommer bevestig word deur feite aangaande die houding van Afrikaner binne en buite Suid-Afrika.

In so 'n voorstelling van feite moet aangetoon word dat Suid-Afrika, deur foutief, in baie gevalle, die natuurlike en gewettigde aspirasies en grie-

we van Afrikaner met die kommunisme te vereenselwig (die kommunisme word deur die wet verbied) net die teenoorgestelde bereik van wat dit beoog nl. om die waardes en stabiliteit van die volk en die gemeenskap te verseker.

(2) Daar moet gepoog word om alternatiewe oplossings te vind wat aan Suid-Afrika ware hulp sal verskaf om die probleem op te los en garanties teen inmenging van buite te gee, mits Suid-Afrika ernstig begeer om sy rassebeleid in hersiening te bring ten einde die situasie binne 'n ooreengekome tydperk te verander.

II. Kerke. Ons verwys weer na die verklaring van die Uitvoerende Komitee van die Kommissie van die Kerke oor Internasionale Sake en van die Wêreldraad van Kerke in Julie 1965, en ons wil herinner dat 'n aantal aanbevelinge wat destyds gemaak is, nog net so geldig is as drie jaar gelede, maar dat hierdie aanbevelinge in baie opsigte nie uitgevoer is met enige positiewe resultate nie.

Ons dring derhalwe nogmaals daarop aan dat kerke, organisasies en enkelinge, binne sowel as buite Suid-Afrika, in 'n gesamentlike poging, die volgende moet onderneem en uitbrei:

(a) 'n groter uitruiling van Christelike voorgangers uit alle rasse (geestelikes en gewone lidmate) tussen Suid-Afrikaanse en alle ander lande, insonderheid diegene wat historiese bande met Suid-Afrika het, sodat 'n nuwe houding en uitkyk onder die blanke bevolkingsgroepe bewerkstellig kan word;

(b) gereelde uitruiling van studente- en jeugleierskap om sodoende gemeenskap aan te moedig tussen die volksgroepe van Suid-Afrika en buitelanders;

(c) 'n meer gereelde uitruiling van nuusberigte en informasie tussen kerke binne en buite Suid-Afrika;

(d) die morele en finansiële hulp aan alle kerke, en die ondersteuning van alle organisasies in hul arbeid vir rasse-censgesindheid met geregtigheid en menslike waardigheid in Suid-Afrika.

Ons maak 'n beroep op alle kerke buite Suid-Afrika om 'n gesprek te begin en voort te sit met alle kerke in Suid-Afrika oor rassevraagstukke en ander probleme wat nadelig in-

werk op die lewe en getuienis van die Christelike Kerk, ten einde versoening tussen teenoor mekaar staande beskouinge en groepe teweeg te bring.

Ons wil ook aan alle kerke en Christene in Suid-Afrika laat verstaan dat terwyl kerke en Christene buite Suid-Afrika alles in hul vermoë wil doen om verandering te bring, dit in laatste instansie die verantwoordelikheid van die Suid-Afrikaanse gemeenskap self is om die verandering teweeg te bring, insonderheid die Christene van dié gemeenskap.

En nou II: die verklaring van die Christian Reformed Church oor rasse-aangeleenthede. Die jaarlikse Vergadering van die Christian Reformed Church te Grand Rapids is deur sy Raad van Inwendige Sending aangespoor tot die verwydering van rassisme uit die kerk en die gemeenskap. Die Sinode het ook 'n oproep gedoen en het verklaar dat die kerke gewilliglik as broeders moet ontvang, afgesien van ras of kleur, almal wat hul sonde bely en die geloof in Jesus Christus aanneem.

Die Sinode het sy verklaring laat voorafgaan deur te sê: „In sy begeerte dat mense van alles rasse mag saamwoon in gehoorsaamheid aan die Woord van God, stel die Christelike Gereformeerde Kerk hierdie getuienis aangaande die onderrig van die Woord, met die ernstige bede dat daar deur die krag van die Heilige Gees 'n vernuwning van die maatskappy, volgens sy wil sal plaasvind.

Die Sinode het sy Raad van Inwendige Sending gevra „om programma's te beplan en uit te voer, waardeur die gesindte, individuele kerke en lidmate alle beskikbare middele doeltreffend kan gebruik, om rassisme te verwyder, sy oorsake en gevolge, in die liggaam van gelowiges en dwarsdeur die wêreld waarin ons woon”.

Die besluit om 'n spesiale biddag vir vernuwning uit te roep, is op aandrang van die gemeente Chicago geneem, wat 'n kragtige teenstand teen rassisme handhaaf. 14 Julie is aangewys as 'n dag van gebed waarin lidmate van die Christian Reformed Church hulle sal verootmoedig en gesamentlik sal bid dat die Almagtige God in sy onvergelyklike liefde 'n

vernuwing van die maatskappy sal teweegbring, deur middel van die getroue verkondiging en toepassing van die Evangelie van sy reddende en versoenende liefde, sodat mense van verskillende rasse van hul sondige vyandigheid gereinig mag word, deur die versoenende bloed van Jesus Christus, en saam mag woon in die gemeenskap van liefde, onder die tug van sy heerskappy."

In 'n sterk uitgedrukte verklaring het die Sinode gesê dat „lidmate van die Christian Reformed Church, as broeders moet ontvang, ongeag hul ras of kleur, almal wat berou het oor hul sonde en die geloof in Jesus Christus as Saligmaker bely; dat uitsluiting van volle Christelike gemeenskap weens ras of kleur sondig is; en dat lidmate wat verantwoordelik is vir sodanige uitsluiting moet be-

handel word volgens die voorskrifte van die Kerkorde rakende vermaning en tug."

Die Sinode het dit duidelik gestel, dat vrees vir vervolging of skade aan eie persoon of instelling, wat ontstaan uit gehoorsaamheid aan Christus, aan niemand die verloëning van volle Christelike gemeenskap in die kerk of verwante organisasies weens ras of kleur regverdig nie.

GESKIEDENIS AS WAARSKUWING

— PROF. DR. A. VAN SELMS

(Na aanleiding van dr. C. J. Labuschagne, *Schriftprofetie en Volksideologie*, Openbare les gegee ter geleentheid van de aanvaarding van het ambt van lector in de israëlitische letterkunde en de uitlegging van het Oude Testament aan de Rijksuniversiteit te Groningen op Dinsdag 29 Oktober 1968, Uitgeverij G. F. Gallenbach N.V., Nijkerk, 1968.)

Ons mis nog daeliks die beminlike omgang met dr. Labuschagne en ons kan die Universiteit van Groningen asook die Nederlandse wetenskaplike publiek nie sonder 'n sekere jaloersheid nie, gelukwens dat hulle nou meer as ons gebruik kan maak van sy wetenskaplike werkkrag en besonke oordeel. In watter gees hy sy onderwys aan die Groningse studente in die teologie gee, blyk met groot duidelikheid uit sy „openbare les" wat as 'n klein, maar uiters waardevolle boekie die vorige maand die lig gesien het. Ons kan ons lesers nie genoeg aanraai om hierdie boekie by hulle boekwinkels te bestel nie; as hulle dit in genoegsame aantal doen, sal dit sekerlik op die rakke van die Afrikaanse boekhandels verskyn en wellig word dit ook gelees deur mense, wat dit nog meer nodig het as ons lesers.

Die skrywer behandel die protes van die profete van Israel teen die geestelike klimaat waarin hulle volksen tydenote geleef het. Hy ondersoek die volksideologie wat aan daardie geestelike klimaat ten grondslag lê, die geheel van die ideë waarteen die egte profete van Israel, in teenstelling met die beroepsmatige geestelike leiers, in verset gekom het. Sowel die egte skrifprofete as die volksprofete het dieselfde geestelike

erfenis ontvang, leef uit dieselfde godsdienstige oorlewerings, verkondig dat hulle deur God geroep is en beskou hulle prediking as die verkondiging van die woord van God, maar tog is daar 'n onoorbrugbare kloof tussen wat deur die skrifprofet en wat deur die volksman verteenwoordig word. Hierdie tweespalt tussen volksortuiging en die werklike godsboodskap het die krisis in die geskiedenis van Israel tot uiting gebring en tot die heftigste konflikte gelei in die godsdienstige lewe — en daardeur onvermydelik ook in die maatskaplike en staatkundige bestaan van die ou Godsvolk.

KENMERKE VAN DIE VOLKSIDEOLOGIE

As 'n eerste kenmerk van die volksideologie noem dr. Labuschagne 'n *etnosentriese nasionaal-politieke religiositeit*. Die leser wat sy uiters bekwame geskiedkundige uiteensetting tot nou toe rustig gevolg het, skrik op: was dit alleen die volk Israel wat so 'n vorm van religiositeit geken het? Ken ons ook nie die soort geestelike welbehae waarmee 'n volk homself as besonder godsdienstig beskrywe, van naby nie? Is ook nie nader tuis 'n godsdienstige aanwesig waarin die volk self as die draer van die vernaamste waardes van die godsdienst verheerlik word nie? „Hierdie religiositeit", so skrywe Labuschagne, „was etnosentrië, partikularisties en anti-ekumenies en het die nasionale hoogmoed sterk bevorder, soos onder meer blyk uit die feit dat Israel homself in die dae van Amos as die „keur van die volke" beskou het." Ag ja, òns is gelukkig nog nie aangetas deur die

morele verval van Europa en die kommunisme van die Wêreldraad nie!

Die tweede kenmerk van die volksideologie is die *pretensie van soliditeit*: Israel beskou homself as onskendbaar, veilig beskut, want alles lê vas in 'n dogma wat tegelyk 'n programma is. God sal altyd handel in ooreenstemming met die tradisie soos deur die beroepsmatige leiers vertolk. Die sekerheid dat die Here met hierdie volk is, bewerk 'n gelatenheid en onversteurbaarheid wat 'n totale sedelike verslapping in die hand werk, sonder dat die volk daarvan bewus is. Weer vra ons: was dit maar net in Israel so, of kom dit nou nog voor dat 'n volk homself veilig wil stel deur valse sekerhede aan sy nasionale tradisies te wil ontleen?

En dan kom daar as 'n derde kenmerk die *kollektiwisme*, die wegdringing van die besef van persoonlike verantwoordelikheid, omdat kollektiewe verantwoordelikheid in die praktyk dikwels beteken dat niemand verantwoordelik is nie. Ten koste van alles word eenstemmigheid gehandhaaf. Geen teenspraak, geen verskil van mening, geen kritiek word geduld nie; wat van die algemene opinie afwyk, word as rebellie, verraad en dislojaliteit beskou. Die groep stoot die enkeling wat protesteer uit, stuur hom die woestyn in, beroof hom van sy posisie, ontnem hom die geleentheid om sy hoognodige boodskap tot die volk te spreek. Onbekende dinge vir ons, hierdie?

Ten slotte is daar die *vermoë om te plooi*, om met die realiteit te skipper, om teenstrydighede te harmoniseer en die feite in ooreenstemming met die teorie te bring. Deur die ideologie verloor die mense die

vermoë om die werklikheid te sien; hulle leer om te verswyg wat vir die volksbelange nadelig sou kon wees en om uit te basuin wat in die belang daarvan geag word. Hy wat die verkeerde die beste toesmeer, word as die trouste dienaar van sy volk gehuldig. Die vrede en goeie verstandhouding tussen die gelykdenkendes is die hoogste goed. Hou bymekaar wat by mekaar hoort!

'N WAARSKUWING AAN ONS

Dit is of Labuschagne nie Israel nie, maar ons beskrywe. En tog gee hy in die note op die laaste vier

bladsye van sy boekie vir elke element wat hy genoem het die bewysplekke uit die Ou Testament. Alles wat hy sê is ontleen aan die Woord van God soos dit deur die profete tot Israel gekom het. As Israel se geestelike klimaat, en die volksideologie wat daaraan ten grondslag lê, sulke sterk ooreenkomste vertoon met wat ons daeliks hier en nou teenkom, dan word dit hoog tyd dat ons gaan luister na daardie profetiese protes teen die volksideologie. Want soos Paulus, terugblikkend op die geskiedenis van Israel dit in I Kor. 10:11 sê: „Al hierdie dinge het hulle

oorgekom as voorbeelde en is opgeskrywe as 'n waarskuwing aan ons op wie die eindes van die eeue gekom het.' Die taak van die verkondiger van die Godswoord, so haal Labuschagne uit Klgl. 2:14 aan, is om sy volk se ongeregtheid te openbaar, om sy lot te verander. Sonder daardie aanklag kom geen lotsverandering tot stand nie. Daar is geen hoop vir 'n volk wat hom deur sy ideologie afgrendel van die profetiese protes nie. o Land, land, land, hoor die woord van die Here! En anders? 586: Val van Jerusalem, vernietiging van die volksbestaan.

Letters — Briewe

AANVAAR NIE ROOMSE GELOOF

Ds. Nico van Loggerenberg, Posbus 346, Benoni.

Die skrywe van mnr. J. A. Duigan in die Oktober-uitgawe van *Pro Veritate* het my tot bejammering gestem.

Ek verkies om nie te reageer op opmerkings wat persoonlik van aard is nie, en bepaal my slegs by die kardinale waarhede.

1. Die Maria-aanbidding:

Mnr. Duigan was gevra om die Bybelse gronde vir die gebedsaanroepinge van Maria te gee. Hy het jammerlik gefaal. Hy was nie in staat om 'n enkele bewys uit die mond van Christus, die Seun, of Petrus of Johannes of Paulus aan te haal nie, maar hy troos hom met die „hoogste verering" van Calvyn en Luther. Genoemde Hervormers het Maria hoog geëer maar nie aanbid nie. Ons wil die Bybelgronde vir die gebedsaanroeping, *aanbidding* hê, en nie die Roomse tradisie of die billike lof van Calvyn en Luther nie.

2. Die onfeilbaarheidsleer:

Mnr. Duigan verwys na 'n paar Skrifwoorde wat die onfeilbaarheidsdogma sou bewys, en beweer dat die pous dit „selde" gebruik. Dit maak nie saak of dit „selde" of dikwels gebruik word nie, ons wil die Bybelgronde daarvoor hê! Ons bly oortuig dat dit 'n menslike kettery is.

Matt. 16:18 en 19.

Die Here het vir Simon Bar-Jona gesê: Jy is „Petros" en op „hierdie petra (rots) sal Ek my gemeente bou". Die Here het nooit vir Petrus gesê dat hy 'n „rotsman" is of dat Hy sy gemeente op hom, Petrus, gaan bou nie, maar op die *petra*, die rotsbelydenis van Petrus, naamlik: U is die Christus, die Seun van die lewende God. Mnr. Duigan erken: „Petrus het nooit iets vir homself toegeëien nie" en tog handhaaf hy die onfeilbaarheid van die pous.

Luk. 22:21-22 en Joh. 21:15-17.

Hierdie twee Skrifgedeeltes het met die onfeilbaarheid van Petrus en die pous geen verband nie, maar dit leer juis die feilbaarheid van Petrus en die voorbidding van Jesus sowel as die opsoekende liefde wat die gevalle Petrus opsoek. Die onfeilbaarheid van die pous is 'n menslike kettery wat op geen Bybelgronde berus nie.

3. Die Roomse tradisie:

Mnr. Duigan beroep hom op II Thes. 2:15 en II Tim. 2:2. Die „voorskrifte" en dit „wat jy van my gehoor het onder baie getuies" en wat aan „getroue manne" toevertrou moet word, gee beslis geen grond vir die Roomse voortgesette tradisie of openbaringsleer nie. Petrus het Christus en Christus alleen verkondig (Vgl. Pinksterdag en alle ander toesprake) en Paulus wou „niks anders . . ." as Jesus Christus en Hom as gekruisigde" weet nie. (I Kor. 2:2). Paulus het nooit 'n mens-tradisie geleer nie, maar hy het Christus verkondig, daarom berus mnr. Duigan se verwarring nie op 'n enkele Bybelteks nie, maar op menslike dwalinge.

4. Maria Mede-Verlosseres:

Mnr. Duigan erken onomwonde: „Daar is geen Bybelgronde nie" en tog vereer en aanbid hy Maria as „Mede-Verlosseres". Dit is onbegryplik! Die Roomse geloof is ook hier 'n onbybelse mensgeloof wat op menslike dogmas en tradisies berus, maar nie op die leerstelling van Christus nie. Dit is 'n mensgeloof wat beslis ook nie op die leerstelling van Petrus of Johannes of Paulus berus nie, maar dit berus op onbybelse dogmas.

Dit is ook vir my baie duidelik dat mnr. Duigan vanweë sy Roomse tradisie-geloof die kettery van Thomas van Aquino ook nie verstaan nie en Thomas tot „'n wêreldberoemde teoloog" verhef. Is mnr. Duigan werklik so onkundig in die leer van die Bybel en die denksistiem van Thomas? Weet hy dan nie dat die dualistiese natuur-genade-idee die heidenom en die Christendom teologies-filosofies verbaster het nie? Nee, mnr. Duigan. Thomas was 'n groot denker maar beslis nie 'n „wêreldberoemde" teoloog nie, want sy teologie was nie die teologie van die Bybel nie.

Ek wil mnr. Duigan gelyk gee: Ek is „nie bereid om die waarheid . . . oor die Roomse Kerk" gelowig te aanvaar

nie, ek is slegs bereid om wetenskaplik daarvan kennis te neem en ek verwerp dit, omdat dit op geen Bybelgronde berus nie.

(Verkort)

GOD WANTS CHURCH BUILDINGS

Joy Clutton, Addo, C.P.

Rosemary Elliot wonders what would happen if all the church buildings were suddenly removed. She need not think very hard to find the answer. What happened when Coventry cathedral was destroyed? Immediately the best architects and artists recreated the church as beautifully as they could. And so it always has been and will be. Even hundreds of years BC we get 'the Lord saying unto Moses' virtually — 'Get the Children of Israel to bring me of their best to build me a house.'

Surely no one is so stupid to imagine that God can only be met, or can only be worshipped in churches. But because we believe that there is strength in getting together — where two or three are gathered together in my name — that gathering must be housed, and that house should surely be something special; of the very best. This almost seems ordained by God himself.

Throughout the ages men have given their best, often their whole lives, to the building of beautiful churches. Rosemary Elliott asks where God is to be found. I do not need to tell her that God is very certainly to be found in every beautiful thing; when one "adores" a lovely rose one worships God, and how many have worshipped him, both knowingly and unknowingly in the beautiful buildings dedicated to his name.

No, it would not help to demolish the churches, the dynamite must be used on the people inside them; to find God so certainly in the churches that in their lives He will be very evident to the world around them.

**WHAT IS THE
ALTERNATIVE?**

Mr. V. G. Davies, 89 Kloof Road, Sea Point, Cape Town.

In view of what you have to say in your editorial "Cross Road" (November issue), I think you are now called upon to explain to your readers what your immediate plan for South Africa is. Do you advocate, in the name of Christ, immediate abolition of apartheid? Do you believe that, as Christians, we are morally obliged to hand the whole country over to Black majority rule in the near future? Would you say that, again as Christians, we should be prepared to risk plunging the country into social and economic chaos by overthrowing the status quo — the status quo which, although imperfect and in need of reform, is preserving peace and prosperity in the country? I am not suggesting that nothing should be done to improve the situation, but I am firmly of the opinion that if we are to ensure that our last state does not become far worse than our first, we shall have to be very careful not to disturb the status quo too much, particularly at this unsettled juncture of world affairs. I do not question for one moment your sincerity and good intentions, but I am puzzled as to what your immediate plan for this country is.

(It is our conviction that no improvement in race relations in South Africa will come about unless the system of apartheid as such is abolished. There can be no improvement in race relations until we shed our delusions. Apartheid is simply the name for our national delusion that justice can be obtained without cost: integration, that justice can happen without working for it. Nobody except totalitarians and anarchists wants chaos. But we deceive ourselves if we think that order can be maintained by immobilizing the status quo. We have indeed no clear-cut answer as to what the alternative to apartheid should be, but from a Christian as well as from a practical point of view it seems to be clear that apartheid offers no "solution". It also lies beyond doubt that the application of a principle of apartheid to a multi-racial but unitary community must inevitably lead to injustices, not only to individuals but also to whole communities. Therefore another spiritual basis has to be found for the arrangement of our South African society. The gospel teaches us that this spiritual basis is the reconciliation in Christ. However, the Theological Commission of the S.A. Council of Churches is at present working on the implications of the "Message to the People of South Africa" and suggestions which might indicate the direction in which the practical, Christian way of dealing with our racial problems should be sought. — Editor.)

BOEKBESPREKING

Dr. A. A. van Ruler, *Ik geloof. De twaalf artikelen van het geloof in morgenwijdungen*. G. F. Callenbach N.V., Nijkerk 1968. 158 bladsye. Prys f.9.90.

In een-en-veertig radio-oordenkings het die skrywer, bekende dogmatikus aan die Rijksuniversiteit te Utrecht, die Twaalf Artikels bespreek. Vir die feit dat dit nou in boekvorm verskyn het, kom skrywer en uitgewers ons hartlike dank toe. Dit is 'n verkwikkende boek, uiteraard as „morgenwijdungen" nie slegs leesbaar vir vakteoloë nie, maar van die grootste waarde vir alle gelowiges, juis van ons tyd. Taal en uitdrukings is helder en eenvoudig en die skrywer slaag meesterlik daarin om sy gedagtes aan die leser tuis te bring. Tog is dit geen eenvoudige stof waaroor daar gehandel word nie. Ons het hier byna iets soos 'n dogmatiek in beknopte vorm. Liefhebbers van die geskifte van Van Ruler (en die getal in Suid-Afrika word steeds groter) sit by die lees van hierdie boek as't ware aan die voete van 'n groot leermeester en luister met verrukking na sy lering uit 'n rykdom van kennis en insigte, word meegevoer deur sy liefde vir die geloofskatte van die kerk en gee hom onvoorwaardelik daarin gelyk dat 'n prysgawe van die eeue-oue geloofsposisies van die kerk die Christenwees self bedreig. Ek aarsel nie om dit een van Van Ruler se beste werke te noem nie, sonder dat ek sou kon sê of daar ook 'n ander kategorie is. Nie omdat hy hiermee iets nuuts aanbied nie. Intendeel, die bekende Van Ruler is in elkeen van hierdie oordenkings op sy kenmerkende wyse aan die woord. Dit is die onvermoeide pleitbetsorger vir die teokrasie wat ons hier weer hoor: „Jezus wil niet alleen over de harten regeren. Maar ook over die hoofden. Ook over de hoofden van de staat en de wereld, de overheden en de machten. Zij moeten alle aan hem onderworpen worden. Het rijk van Christus wil ook volledige gestalte krijgen in het sociale en het politieke, nationaal en internationaal". Ons kom weer diep onder die indruk van die skoonheid van die trinitariese belydenis, van die katoelike wydheid van die Christelike geloof, van die liefde waarmee God hierdie stoflike wêreld tot in ewigheid vashou, van die heiliging van ons totale bestaan as die „hoofsaak" van die evangelie, van die heerskappy van Christus as 'n werklikheid wat nou geskied — die Godsregering „op die wyse van die verberging in die vlees" — van die verwagting van ons volkome verlossing waardeur ons totale bestaan „gestempel en gestroomlyn" word. Dit is alles tipies Van Ruler. Maar die gloed en die oortuiging waarmee hy praat uit die geloofskatte van die kerk van die eeue, laat dit oornuut skitter soos 'n diamant onder soveel teologiese rommel waarmee ons bedolwe word in 'n tyd van plastiek-kultuur en massa-produksie, van verplating van die hele lewe en van vervreemding van God. Predikante sal hierdie boek opfrisend en inspirerend vind, en elke Christengelowe wat homself die vreugde wil vergun om dit te lees, sal met 'n nuwe verrassing ontdek watter vaste ankers daar vir die Christen is, juis in ons tyd, om saam met die kerk van die eeue te bely: Ek glo. (B. E.)

Garden Route

*Adam, seeking to return,
Crept round and round
The garden fenced
By fire and sword of God:
Found no way back to home.*

*Inside the camp,
His greater son,
Moved toward the wires.
Sin and Death, on guard,
Fingered their guns.
He did not flinch, but cut:
They shot, he fell.*

*We know,
Our guards know too,
Where wires once stretched
Unbroken, triple deep,
In one place now they coil,
Irreparable and limp:
Our way out,
Our way home.*

Christmas 1968

