



PRO VERITATE

"TWELVE STATEMENTS"

Reactions

H. BERKHOF

Quest for full Humanity

ELS TE SIEPE

A.I.C. Women hit their Stride

B. B. KEET

Gereformeerde Kerke en Wêreldraad

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

PRO VERITATE

REDAKSIE

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

REDAKSIONELE KOMITEE:
Biskop B. B. Burnett; Eerw. J. de
Gruchy; Eerw. A. W. Habelgaarn;
Eerw. E. E. Mahabane; Mnr. J. E.
Moulder; Ds. C. F. B. Naudé
(Voorsitter); Prof. dr. A. van
Selms.

ADMINISTRASIE/ KORRESPONDENSIE

SIRKULASIEBESTUURDER:
Dr. W. B. de Villiers.

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

INTEKENGELD

Intekengeld is vooruitbetaalbaar.

Land-en seepos: R1 (10/- of \$1.40)
— Afrika; R1-50 (15/- of \$2.10)
— 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, Johan-
nesburg.

LET WEL

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

PRO VERITATE verskyn elke 15de
van die maand.

(Prys per enkel-eksemplaar 10c)

CHRISTELIKE MAANDBLAD VIR SUIDELIKE AFRIKA CHRISTIAN MONTHLY FOR SOUTHERN AFRICA

IN HIERDIE UITGAWE...

IN THIS ISSUE...

- Die onlangs gepubliseerde Christe-
like Verkiesingsmanifes het aansien-
like aandag van die Pers ontvang.
Ons bied hiervan 'n oorsig. bl. 2
- The recently published Christian
Election Manifesto elicited consider-
able Press publicity. Of this we offer
a survey p. 2
- Vir watter politieke party moet die
Christen stem in die lig van die
„Twaalf Stelling”? Op hierdie
vraag word daar verskillende ant-
woorde gebied deur:
* Leon J. Kok
* Peter Randall
* Braam Erasmus bl. 5
- For what political party must the
Christian vote in the light of the
"Twelve Statements"? Various an-
swers to this question are given by:
* Leon J. Kok
* Peter Randall
* Braam Erasmus p. 5
- Dr. Hendrikus Berkhof, hoogleraar in
die Dogmatiek en Bybelse Teologie
aan die Universiteit Leiden, lewer
'n indringende studie oor die span-
ninge tussen die Evangelie en die
drang tot voller menslikheid. bl. 9
- Dr. Hendrikus Berkhof, Professor of
Dogmatics and Biblical Theology at
Leyden University, offers an incisive
study on the tensions between the
Gospel and the urge towards a
fuller humanity. p. 9
- Merkwaaardige ontwikkelings is besig
om plaas te vind onder die vroue
van die Onafhanklike Bantoekerke.
Hieromtrent verskaf Els te Siepe
nadere inligting. bl. 13
- Remarkable developments are taking
place among the women of the
African Independent Churches. Els
te Siepe provides a close-up
view. p. 13
- Prof. B. B. Keet vertel iets meer om-
trent die onlangse aansluiting van
die Gereformeerde Kerke in Neder-
land by die Wêreldraad van
Kerke. bl. 14
- Prof. B. B. Keet gives more specific
information about the affiliation of
the Reformed Churches in the
Netherlands to the World Council
of Churches. p. 14

Inleidingsartikel:

GEWETENS GETOETS

Die Christelike Verkiesingsmanifes of sogenoemde „Twaalf Stellinge“ is 'n toets vir die gewetens van Suid-Afrikaanse Christenkiessers. En net so veelseggend as die inhoud van die Manifesto is die wyse waarop dese en gene op hierdie toets gereageer het.

Van die kant van die Afrikaans-Nasionalistiese „establishment“ (d.w.s. die Regering, die Afrikaanse pers en die Hollands-Afrikaanse kerke) was die reaksie een van berekende onverskilligheid en afsydigheid, met hier en daar 'n felle aanval op die Manifesto en 'n hartstogtelike verdediging van die Nasionale Party se rassebeleid.

Dit tref 'n mens dat diegene van Afrikanerkant wat hulle wel verwerdig het om te reageer, die saak so maklik gewonne gegee het. Die manifest, hoewel streng Bybels in opset, is in sulke wawyd algemene taal opgestel dat dit goed denkbaar was dat sommige van die meer behendige apartheidsapologete 'n geloofwaardige regverdiging vir dié beleid daaruit sou kon voortrasionaliseer.

Dat hulle dit nie gedoen het nie, dog dat hulle onmiddellik 'n aanval op die Nasionale Party (en, by implikasie, 'n voorspraak vir die Progressiewe Party) in die dokument gelees het, hou 'n veelseggende bekentenis in: 'n erkenning dat daar net nie meer 'n Christelike regverdiging vir die Regeringsbeleid te bedink is nie. Ten spyte van die veelgeroemde „Christelike beginsels“ van die Nasionale Party sien geeneen van sy vernaamste spreekbuise blykbaar meer kans om sy daadwerklike beleid op Christelike grondslag te verdedig nie. Inteendeel, die toetsing van politieke praktyk aan eenvoudige dog grondliggende Bybelse norme word ontwyk deur minagtend daarna te verwys as 'n bedekte prediking van die Liberalisme.

Kan dit wees dat die invloed van dr. Albert Hertzog en sy Herstigte Nasionale Party reeds so ver deurgewerk het in Afrikanergeleedere dat selfs die Bybel al vir ons te liberaal geword het?

Voorspelbaar genoeg was die reaksies van die kant van nie-Nasionalistiese instansies veel meer simpatiek. Veral die sogenaamde „Engelse“ pers het aansienlike ruimte aan die Manifesto en aan indringende kommentaar daarop verleen. Hieroor is 'n mens dankbaar.

Wat egter as 'n verrassing gekom het was die mate van kritiek wat die Manifesto moes verduur van die kant van, andersins vermoedelik liberaaldenkende, leiers van die nie-Afrikaanse kerke. Hoewel dié kritiek meesal gegaan het oor kleinighede soos die taal, styl en politieke uitgesprokenheid van die Manifesto, het dit 'n mens verbaas om enige openlike

Editorial:

CONSCIENCES TESTED

The Christian Election Manifesto or so-called "Twelve Statements" puts the consciences of Christian voters in South Africa to the test. And just as significant as the contents of the Manifesto is the way in which various people reacted to this test.

The reaction on the part of the Afrikaans Nationalist "establishment" (i.e. the Government, the Afrikaans press and the Afrikaans churches) was one of studied indifference and aloofness with only here and there a vicious attack upon the Manifesto and a passionate defence of the National Party's racial policy.

What strikes one is that those in Afrikaner circles who did indeed deign to react gave in so easily. The Manifesto, although strictly Biblical in its make-up, is phrased in such broad generalisations that it would have been completely feasible for some of the more adept apartheid apologists to have discovered in it a plausible justification of this policy.

That they did not do so, but that they immediately read into the document an attack upon the National Party (and, by implication, a plea for the Progressive Party) contains in itself a significant admission: an acknowledgement that no Christian justification for the Government's policy can be devised any more. Despite the much vaunted "Christian principles" of the National Party, none of its most important mouthpieces seem to be prepared any longer to defend its actual policy on a Christian basis. On the contrary, the testing of political practice according to simple, though fundamental, Biblical norms is evaded by scornfully referring to it as a covert preaching of Liberalism.

Can it really be that the influence of Dr. Albert Hertzog and his Reconstituted National Party has already penetrated so deeply in Afrikaner circles that even the Bible has become too liberal for us?

Predictably, the reactions on the part of non-Nationalist institutions were far more sympathetic. Especially the so-called "English" press gave considerable publicity to the Manifesto and some thrustful comment upon it. For this one is grateful.

What came as a surprise, however, was the measure of criticism which the Manifesto had to endure from the side of, otherwise presumably liberal-thinking, leaders of the non-Afrikaans churches. Although this criticism mostly dealt with trivialities such as the language, style and political outspokenness of the Manifesto one was surprised to encounter any public criticism at all from the side of men who certainly know all too well what a late hour we have reached

kritiek hoegenaamd te hoor van die kant van mense wat sekerlik maar alte goed weet hoe laat in die dag dit reeds vir ons hier in Suid-Afrika geword het en hoe absoluut noodsaaklik dit is dat so 'n dringende woord van waarskuwing profeties geuiter word.

Kan veral die kerkleiers in Suid-Afrika dit werklik nog bekostig om te redekawel oor eksie-perfeksies van taal en styl wanneer, veral dan op politieke gebied, die grondbeginsels van die Christendom so ernstig en so toenemend bedreig word?

Hoe dit sy: die „Twaalf Stellinge“ is die wêreld ingestuur en staan daar as 'n onverwyderbare en onontwykbare toetssteen vir die gewetens van alle Christene in Suid-Afrika. Dit is maar één toets, soos daar reeds andere was. En daar bestaan nie die minste twyfel nie dat daar nog verdere toetse vir die Christelike gewete sal volg. God laat sy volk nie met rus nie — totdat hulle hul bekeer.

Mag Hy gee dat ons hier in Suid-Afrika die laaste toets, sy oordeelstoets gespaar sal bly.

here in South Africa and how absolutely necessary it is that such an urgent word of warning should receive prophetic utterance.

Can South African Church leaders in particular still really afford to quibble about niceties of language and style when, especially in the field of politics, the fundamental principles of Christianity are being so seriously and increasingly threatened?

In any case, the "Twelve Statements" have been made public and stand there as an irremovable and inescapable touchstone for the consciences of all Christians in South Africa. It represents only a single test. There have been others in the past. And there can be no doubt at all that further tests will be visited upon the Christian conscience. God does not leave his people in peace — until they mend their ways and become converted.

May He grant that we here in South Africa be spared the final test, the test of his judgment.

"TWELVE STATEMENTS"

— REACTIONS

The Christian Election Manifesto issued by 70 leading South African churchmen and laymen in last month's *Pro Veritate* has elicited quite a remarkable response for a day and age in which things "Christian" are often so conveniently ignored.

Perhaps one can already make a preliminary assessment of the impact it has had on Christian consciences, although the real proof of the pudding will, of course, have to wait till election day, on April 22.

As was, perhaps sadly, predictable, the English Press in South Africa gave the "Twelve Statements" very considerable coverage whilst the most influential section of the Afrikaans Press — following the line of the Prime Minister, Dr. Albert Hertzog and the Moderator of the Nederduitse Gereformeerde Kerk, Dr. J. S. Gericke — deliberately ignored it or referred to it only disparagingly. This is a pity indeed, since the Afrikaans Press caters to a readership which comprises the large majority of professing Christians among the Whites in our country. One can only hope that some word of the Biblical message contained in the "Twelve Statements" did in fact succeed in percolating through to the ears and consciences of Afrikaners too.

To give our readers a broad general impression of the type of reactions inspired by the "Twelve Statements" we reproduce hereunder some representative extracts from influential South African newspapers.

POLITICS AND CHRISTIANITY

"It was obvious that the "Christian Election Manifesto" would not be well received by Nationalists. Its meaning, at the very least, is this: "If you are going to vote according to Christian principles, then you cannot vote for the Nationalist Party." . . .

"Are there two conflicting sets of Christian principles, enabling a person to choose the set which is suitable and appropriate for his own particular purpose? If there is in fact only one set of Christian principles, who interprets them correctly: the Government or the Christian Election Manifesto?"

"Quite the most important matter that everyone should start to think about is whether we are entitled to claim Christian principle as a moral basis for our practical, everyday, political policies . . .

"One is entitled to ask the question, because if the Government claims a Christian basis for its actions, what would be difficult about accepting the principles set out in the Manifesto? Christianity is surely one and indivisible . . .

"Here we have the extraordinary picture of both sides claiming the Christian ethos as the foundation for conflicting attitudes to the racial problems of South Africa . . .

"The Manifesto, at any rate, has helped to put the whole problem into better perspective. If people followed the Manifesto's Christian principles, for example, they would unquestionably vote for the equivalent of a liberal party. But since it is equally clear that the vast majority will not vote for a liberal party, what becomes of Christian principles?"

"This really sums up the dilemma of devout Christian people living in South Africa. The racial problem is so complex and so difficult that they find themselves obliged to compromise with their consciences and to water down the application of Christian teaching. Inevitably they must re-

gard the Manifesto as embarrassing and impracticable . . .

"What ought to be conceded is that we have created a kind of 'modified Christianity' in South Africa — a form of Christianity trimmed to meet political and sociological pressures and adjusted to the requirements of a 'unique situation' . . .

"Our way of life' is what we are determined at all costs to preserve, and if Christian principles must be slightly bent in the process, then we are prepared to make the adjustment. Since that is what the mass of the White electorate are prepared to do, and intend to do, why not frankly admit it?

"The Christian Election Manifesto may not be a popular document, but if it has done anything at all, it has effectly exposed the hollowness of many claims about Christianity that fall so readily from the lips of politicians and others: If apartheid is what the people want, then this is presumably what they are going to get; but they may now be disposed to feel that the less we hear about moral principles and Christian principles, the better."

(SUNDAY TIMES, Johannesburg, 25/1/70)

THIS IS NAKED OPPORTUNISM

"A Christian can only support the Hertzog Group or the Progs in the coming election. This is the foolish meaning of the stream of propaganda directed at the electorate from these two sources . . .

"This priestly trash (priesterlike snert — a reference to the Manifesto) is proclaimed a few days after the Biafrans have given up the long, bloody struggle for an independent state and the maintenance of their own identity.

"For the ideal of being apart, millions of them have died from hunger or violence . . .

"We should like to add a thirteenth statement for consideration by all voters:

"Guard against people who exploit religion with naked opportunism for political gain."

(DAGBREEK en LANDSTEM, Johannesburg, 18/1/70)

CROOKED STATEMENTS

"The 70 signatories (of the Manifesto) . . . have not promoted the cause of Christianity by dragging it

into party politics under the cloak of piousness" . . .

"The point of departure of the compilers of the Christian Election Manifesto — a remarkably camouflaged election pamphlet — is that Christians cannot vote for the National Party . . .

"Consequently the Christian Election Manifesto is a liberalist document drawn up by liberalists for liberalists. These people have so bent Christian principles that liberalism is suddenly held up as the political front of all Christians!"

(DIE TRANSVALER, Johannesburg, 19 and 26/1/70)

WHERE IS THEIR ALTERNATIVE?

"The problem of these well-known ivory tower politicians (the signatories) is that their "Christian Manifesto" is appearing in the wrong country at a most inopportune time for them. Why do they not publish a full-page advertisement of a similar manifesto in the London "Times" for the benefit of Nigeria? . . .

"No Christian's Christian conscience will be disturbed for a moment by the manifesto of these seventy . . .

"Is it not now the opportune moment to come to the fore with their "alternative" (to apartheid) in stead of with a hackneyed old "manifesto" which is still just as far removed from the realities of our time and environment as years ago? . . .

"Our calm reaction is simply this: Stop the pious prattling! Give us the 'alternatives to apartheid' which they have promised us, and in such practical, clear terms that the voters may know for what they can vote on April 22 if they do not want apartheid . . .

"If these clerics and educationists are not able to do so they must keep quiet as men who have nothing to contribute to the affairs of state in South Africa and who are using Christianity as a political mask. They are not the only ones now doing it in politics. Our Afrikaans churches and ministers of religion will not by any reaction endow this 'election manifesto' with any value it does not possess or deserve . . .

"Until these men reply to our challenge to circumscribe a clear, practical, multi-national alternative for South Africa their 'ideas' remain mere political propaganda and South Africa also rejects them as such."

(DIE VADERLAND, Johannesburg, 19, 20 and 21/1/70)

WHY DOES VORSTER KEEP MUM ABOUT LIBERALISTS?

"Encouraged by the Vorster Government's concessions with regard to racial separation and its departure from the policy of apartheid, the manifesto unequivocally states that church members should be persuaded to work towards full integration . . .

"While this leftist propaganda is being made Mr. Vorster and his Government keep mum" . . .

(DIE AFRIKANER, Pretoria, 23/1/70)

THINK BEFORE YOU VOTE

"The somewhat shrill response of the Nationalist Press to the Christian Voters' Manifesto is a good deal more significant than the manifesto itself . . .

"The document does not attempt to direct anyone to vote for or against any particular party. It leaves it open to voters, for instance, to conclude that separate development is in the long run more Christian than its alternatives. All it says is: think before you vote.

"But curiously enough at least two Nationalist newspapers have assumed that the manifesto attacks their party, which amounts to an admission that they think their party's policy does not measure up to Christian standards.

"This sensitivity does these Nationalist papers great credit. But it does also lay on them an obligation to try to get their party's policy and practices improved."

(THE STAR, Johannesburg, 19/1/70)

IDEAS FOR VOTERS

"Nationalist organs have immediately declared (the Manifesto) to be propaganda put out by the Progressive Party" . . .

"Coming from mouthpieces of the National Party, with its outstanding record for combining politics with religion, that charge is rich indeed. In the case of the Progressive Party, which is anything but religiously exclusive, it is also patently nonsensical.

"Plainly the manifesto is not advanced as any sort of profession of Church authority for the policy of any political party. Nor does it purport to have the official backing of any branch of the Christian Church or of any religious organisation" . . .

"(But most) important, we believe, is the need for everybody to take seri-

ous notice of the detailed ideas set out by this group of South African citizens of exceptional calibre. Very few of them can in any way be considered political figures. But, like all other citizens, they have a vital interest in the election issues. They are entitled to their say, and their views are worth at least as much attention as those of politicians.

"They make the fundamental but often forgotten point that politics concerns itself with the arrangement of society . . .

"(Theirs) are convictions to which their creed impels them, and they acknowledge that all political parties may be imperfect. If all this seems to many people to add up to support for the Progressive policy — well, that is surely worth thinking about."

(The RAND DAILY MAIL, Johannesburg, 20/1/70)

CHRISTIAN MANIFESTO

"(The Christian Election Manifesto) is valuable in two respects at least. First, it is a challenge to Christians to align private piety and public life, whether or not they assent to all particulars of the manifesto or none.

"It is a false notion that Christianity and politics do not mix. We live in an overgoverned country in an overgoverned world, where most of the decisions which make or mar human lives are corporate ones, made in the name of the electorate. Politicians are ready enough to invoke the will of the people when they legislate; and if the people's will is an ill will how shall the individual escape moral guilt? In South Africa, moreover, one-fifth of the population is indirectly responsible for decisions which govern the lives, livelihoods and happiness of the other four-fifths. This is not a responsibility which any minority is wise enough or unselfish enough to take. Nevertheless, while it exists, good men will exercise it as wisely and unselfishly as they may.

"The second — and silent — challenge of the manifesto is to those who reject it while adhering to the religious creed that gave birth to it. Contemptuous dismissal is no answer to the considered declaration of sincere men and women who have searched their conscience. If, in the opinion of opponents of the manifesto, Christian belief enjoins not this but something else, then let the alternative be put — unequivocally and without dishonest rationalisation. A bad case must

not be allowed to gain credence by default, and if the injustices the manifesto specifies are illusory the sooner they are exposed as such, the better." (The CAPE TIMES, Cape Town, 21/1/70)

"MEDDLING IN POLITICS" DUTY OF CHURCHES

"The argument that the Church should not 'meddle in politics' is the weakest of all the criticisms made against the manifesto.

"Politics are inseparable from many of the important moral and ethical issues of the day, and a Church which does not take an interest in politics, particularly in a racially divided country like South Africa, is not worth its salt.

"The 70 signatories are perfectly within their rights, therefore, to call on all voters to take an intelligent and 'Christian' interest in the present general election . . .

"One might quibble with some of the wording of the manifesto but one cannot challenge the principle that it is the Church's right and duty to 'meddle' in politics. On this principle, the signatories cannot be faulted." (Hogarth de Hoogh in the SUNDAY TIMES, Johannesburg, 25/1/70)

PERSONAL OPINIONS (As reported in the Press)

Cardinal Owen McCann, Roman Catholic Archbishop of Cape Town:

"The election is a matter for the electorate to decide . . . I do not think the church should be involved in this matter . . . In my position as Archbishop I feel that it is better that I do not be associated with it — although personally I may agree with some of it . . . We have so many times made our point clear on this that there is no point in doing it now." (CAPE TIMES, 21/1/70)

The Rev. D. W. Timm, President of the Methodist Conference:

"The church seeks to attain justice, fair play and what is best for everyone in South Africa. But I do not think this dogmatic way of doing things is the best way.

"We may agree with the goal, but do not agree with the method chosen to reach that goal. There are better ways to get people to understand their Christian responsibility." (CAPE TIMES, 21/1/70)

The Rev. E. Lynn Cragg, former President of the Methodist Conference:

"I fully agree with the contents of the manifesto and see it as a way of arousing opinion and making people think.

"It is most necessary for thought to be stimulated at a time like this. I feel the manifesto is a challenge." (CAPE TIMES, 22/1/70)

The Rev. Glen Craig, Moderator of the Presbyterian Church in the Western Cape:

"Before I could sign the manifesto I would first have to find out how the presbytery felt." (CAPE TIMES, 21/1/70)

Dr. J. S. Gericke, Moderator of the Ned. Geref. Kerk:

"I prefer to ignore the 'Christian election manifesto' . . . I don't even want to take notice of those people . . . I prefer not to comment on the 'manifesto' as this would give unnecessary publicity to it." (CAPE ARGUS, 19/1/70)

The Rt. Rev. Leslie Stradling, Anglican Bishop of Johannesburg:

"In my personal and private capacity I agree with every word of the statement, but it seemed to me that the statement was saying that you should vote Progressive.

"Although this is good advice, as far as I am personally concerned, as a leader of the Christian Church, I do not believe I can tell anybody which way they should vote." (RAND DAILY MAIL, 20/1/70)

The Most Rev. Denis Hurley, Roman Catholic Archbishop of Durban:

"As regards content, I am in full agreement with every word of the 12 statements. As regards the presentation, I hesitated for two reasons: First, because I feared that the definite and downright language and style might antagonise more than convince in many cases and, second, because I personally should have preferred something a little less dogmatic and a little more diffident, reflecting the consciousness of my own failures to promote all the values contained in the 12 statements." (RAND DAILY MAIL, 20/1/70)

(Continued on page 12)

One of the main objections to the Christian election manifesto recently published in the form of "Twelve Statements" is that it is too vague, too unspecific, that it does not spell out in party political detail what the responsible Christian voter should do with his vote. This was not, however, the purpose of the manifesto: it was indeed intended to be an unashamedly POLITICAL, but not a PARTY POLITICAL document.

But Christian RESPONSIBILITY in the broad field of politics must ultimately also take concrete shape in the form of party political ACTION at the polling booth. And the Christian voters of South Africa are certainly entitled to ask: what are the actual implications of the "Twelve Statements" for every one of us on April 22, 1970?

PRO VERITATE publishes hereunder three different viewpoints in an attempt to pinpoint the practical issues involved and in the hope of offering greater clarity — if not a clear-cut choice — to many troubled consciences.

REPLY TO THE "TWELVE STATEMENTS"

— LEON J. KOK

I feel it to be my "inescapable political responsibility" to react to the "Twelve Statements" published recently. What is of concern in this respect is the dogma behind the manifesto, the deceit and the assertion that racial differentiation is unanswerable theologically and politically to the doctrines of Christ.

Of differences in society, differences in values must surely be of almost the greatest importance. Each group has its own interpretation as to what is the "common good" and as to what is in accordance with the biblical commandments of reconciliation, truth, justice and love. However, the manifesto tends to imply that it speaks for a transcendent entity. Is one to believe that it solely is in possession of and in contact with what is ultimately right and true? Note ought to be taken of Archbishop Hurley's view that it might have been advisable for the manifesto to have been "less dogmatic and a

(Continued on page 6)

CHRISTIAN PRAGMATISM AND THE GENERAL ELECTION

— PETER RANDALL

There seems to be a fairly cosy assumption in some circles that white Christians who are 'enlightened', 'genuine', 'decent' (or some similar adjective) cannot fail to support the Progressive Party in the forthcoming General Election. This interpretation has apparently been read into the "Twelve Statements" by many people, and it needs careful examination.

The tendency of some Progressives to take unto themselves a monopoly of political morality is as insufferable as the tendency of some Nationalists to assume a monopoly of political wisdom. At the same time, the apparent belief of some Progressives that if the white electorate were suddenly to become 'moral' it would return their party to power is as irritating as the apparent belief of some United Party supporters and leaders that if you don't actually **do** anything but just stick around, then the people will begin to vote for you one day.

(Continued on page 6)

THE PROGS AND THE "TWELVE STATEMENTS"

— A. C. (BRAAM) ERASMUS

The Bishop of Johannesburg put the fat in the fire when he said that he had refrained from signing the Twelve Statements because he thought that they amounted to an injunction to Christians to vote Progressive.

Of course it was never the intention of the signatories to get involved in party politics: in that sense his Lordship was less than fair to them. But of course it happens that the Progs are the only Party now existing whose policy approaches anywhere near to the ethical standards of Christianity: in that sense, it is true that any honest statement of a Christian's belief comes close to being an appeal to vote Progressive. **The Progs can't help this, and nor can the Christians. And with great respect to his Lordship, it is difficult to accept his implied argument that Christian leaders must be silent on great moral issues, simply because there is a political party which says the same sort of thing as they do.**

(Continued on page 8)

(REPLY — Continued from page 5)

little more diffident." The Archbishop's view that "the definite and downright language and style might antagonise more than convince" is a very valid one.

The manifesto is the expression of a group with an obvious political leaning. The right Reverend Leslie Stradling ventured to say that the manifesto is an expression of the Progressive Party. By the premises of the manifesto corresponding to those of the Progressive Party — is it to be assumed that if one is not a Progressive, one cannot profess to be a Christian? The standards of the manifesto would imply this.

CHRISTIAN DIFFERENTIATION

There are many who believe that racial differentiation can be applied on ethical, fair and Christian grounds. Professor N. J. Rhodie holds that the Afrikaner's Christian beliefs and civilized ethical code will not allow him to tolerate the onesided application of apartheid to the advantage of the Whites only. Such belief is still at this stage far from reality, but I see every reason to aspire to it.

I fully acknowledge the existence of a great many social, political and economic evils. However, each can be dealt with on its own merits without having to turn the complete system inside out and upside down. To admonish further Limeville-Stinkwater situations does not require a change in philosophy by those currently subscribing to racial differentiation. Integration is not the answer to matters unrelated to colour.

The assertion that racial differentiation lacks concern for human society is misleading. On the contrary, it is the provision of an order in which each individual racial group can develop into a separate national, political, cultural and social unit according to its own identity and inherent capabilities. Allowance is thus made for the harmonious development of the individual. The individual can assert himself to the full so that those things can be sought which will bring to him and his racial group the greatest benefit in terms of their values. Thus the intrinsic value of both the society and the individual is most definitely recognized.

I cannot accept that the urge towards separation is sinful. Dr. D. F. Malan pointed out that colour differ-

ences are not without a deeper meaning. He said: "The difference in colour is merely the physical manifestation of the contrast between two irreconcilable ways of life. Colour is a symbol of different social ideals, of diversity, of civilization." People keep to their own kind because unnatural relationships are a psychological strain. People prefer to keep to their own language, food, culture, educational level, social status and economic status. There are two reasons for this: People find comfort and ease in their own kind and have pride in their group identity. I thus hold that in the South African context it is inconceivable to believe that — through integration — common interest would destroy existing differences. I will go so far as to say that integration would remain highly superficial. Enforced integration will not dispel conflict, but will more likely increase it. We have only to turn to Biafra or the American South to witness this phenomenon.

VALID CLAIMS

Those who subscribe to apartheid do not base its appeal on false claims and promises. This is the instrumental view of those who reject it. Progress made in the practical implementation is the most cited example. The fact that apartheid is a long term policy subject to the tempo and scope of the Non-European capacity to develop is unfairly ignored. The task is greater than was the construction of Rome! As to whether the gap between idealism and practical implementation will ever be completely narrowed is as questionable as to whether enforced integration will completely dispel conflict or not. Only the test of time and circumstance can provide the answer.

Apartheid as we know it in South Africa does exhibit injustice towards Non-White individuals and population groups. But it would be wrong to believe that such injustice is necessary. Racial differentiation need not be synonymous with discrimination in which equality of treatment is denied. Racial differentiation can mean differential treatment on as equal a basis as possible. The minimization of offence and injury to human dignity is possible without the negation of differentiation.

The view that apartheid is based on group selfishness and the furtherance of sectional interests is not an absolutely true reflection of the Afri-

kaner outlook. Traces of the above outlook do exist, but on a limited scale. The instinct of national preser-

vation is the fundamental motive behind the ideology. To the Afrikaner, assimilation will mean the constitutional and national suicide of the Whites. It is felt that the Afrikaner culture, way of life and bio-genetical identity will be undermined by the numerically superior Bantu. To say that the apartheid ideology is at stake is to say that the Afrikaner's way of life is in the balance. The Afrikaner's greatest fear is that the institutions and traditions that he cherishes may be torn from him and hateful ones put in their place. The concept of "separate freedoms" is important in this respect. In acknowledging the realities of group differences, it provides an area of non-interference for each racial group. It is the antithesis to exploitation and suppression and the very basis of self determination and self realization.

Yes, do not be deluded, a vote in favour of racial differentiation can be in accordance with the biblical commandments of truth, justice, love and reconciliation.

(PRAGMATISM — Continued from page 5)

POLITICAL FLUIDITY

We have now a political situation that is more fluid than at any time in the past twenty years. No less than six political parties are going to contest the election, and at least four of these command the support of significant numbers of voters. The governing party faces the probability of serious losses, with all the psychological effects this will have, and with all the dangers this will pose for the party in the 1975 General Election.

How serious the Nationalists' losses will be this year will only become apparent after 22 April, when the extent of the Herstigte Nasionale Party's appeal to the Afrikaner will be clearer, and it will also be clearer to what extent the United Party has benefitted through the split in the formerly solid Afrikaner Nationalist vote.

So how is the 'enlightened' Christian who sincerely rejects racial discrimination and who abhors the present injustice perpetrated on South Africa's Black, Coloured and Indian people, to act in the General Election?

(Continued overleaf)

The following seem to me to be some of the considerations which should guide him:

- he must exercise his vote responsibly;
- he must vote according to what he honestly believes are the best interests of the voteless;
- he must vote in such a way as appears to offer the best means of securing change in South Africa;
- he must not succumb to the myth of Nationalist political infallibility.

VOTE PROG.?

Let us examine, in the light of these considerations, the proposition that the 'enlightened' or anti-apartheid Christian has no alternative but to vote for the Progressive Party. A number of other alternatives immediately suggest themselves:

- (i) He can abstain from voting altogether, thus demonstrating his rejection of the whole evil system. This would, however, seem pretty ineffectual as a protest — and one thing we are beginning to learn is that unless a protest is going to be at least reasonably effective it is better to refrain from it. It might also be regarded as the irresponsible waste of a vote. It could even be regarded as a hypocritical opting-out unless he also attempts in his personal life to live outside the system, which is virtually impossible anyway, since schools, buses, cinemas, suburbs, jobs, laws, public laboratories, hospitals and graveyards are all inextricably part of that system, and all whites are caught up in it willy-nilly. **Maybe there are some whites who are courageous and clever enough really to live outside apartheid. If there are, they are probably identified more with 'underground' than with 'white' politics, and the General Election is irrelevant to them anyway.**

VOTE NAT.?

- (ii) Since in all probability the country will continue to be governed by Afrikaner Nationalism after April, 1970, and for a long time to come, the Christian may decide to vote for the National Party in the belief that the Vorster brand of nationalism is pre-

ferable to the Hertzog brand. This, however, would be to act in maintenance of the status quo, which is intolerable.

VOTE H.N.P.?

- (iii) Or he may decide to cast his vote for the Herstigte. Two reasons could motivate him to do this:

- (a) the belief that he is thereby helping to widen the split in Afrikaner nationalism;
- (b) the belief that the best way to secure change is to seek the election of a frankly reactionary regime which will tighten the screws so far that Black resentment and frustration will build up to explosion point.

This Machiavellian approach poses certain difficulties for the Christian voter: since his motives must necessarily remain concealed, he cannot object when the Herstigte Party feel encouraged and strengthened by his 'support'; and the morality of deliberately seeking to 'tighten the screws' on **other** people is dubious, to say the least.

- (iv) The anti-apartheid Christian voter may, of course, decide to form yet another party. Well, good luck to him, and we may hear more of him later, but he is unlikely to figure much in this election.

- (v) Or he may take a cool, as opposed to an ideologically committed, look at the Progressive Party and its policies and decide that

- (a) they have no earthly hope of general acceptance by the South African voters at this time, and that in fact the party may very likely have no parliamentary representation after April, 1970;

- (b) Progressive policies are not all that 'Christian' anyway, with their tacit acceptance of privilege and a capitalistic structure, and their discrimination through the device of the qualified franchise;

- (c) to vote Progressive in the 1970 General Election will be a futile gesture, unhelp-

ful to the disenfranchised although possibly conscience-salving to the voter himself.

VOTE U.P.!

Should he decide these things, the anti-apartheid Christian voter may then take a cool, as opposed to an ideologically prejudiced, look at the United Party, and he may decide the following:

- (a) the U.P. remains the only party with any chance of becoming an alternative government, with approximately 40 per cent of the electorate's support, with a succession of minor advances since 1966 in by-election after by-election, and with substantially improved prospects following the Herstigte breakaway;

- (b) the U.P.'s more flexible, *laissez faire* approach offers more hope for the disenfranchised than the rigid ideologically-bound National Party;

- (c) the U.P. is committed to repealing some of the more abhorrent of the country's present laws affecting the rights of the individual and race relationships, such as the Immorality Act, B.O.S.S., and the Prohibition of Proper Interference Act.

- (d) the U.P. would have a more relaxed and permissive attitude towards such matters as television and censorship, thus allowing not only greater personal freedom to the individual South African, but also assisting in the growth of a more enlightened public attitude.

In view of these and other factors the pragmatic Christian may well decide that his vote should go this year to the United Party. Being pragmatic, he will not take out membership of that party, nor will he swear undying, undeviating loyalty to its principles and policies.

But, driven by the cold logic of our present political position, he may decide that the biggest contribution he can make to change in South Africa through his privileged vote is to offer it to the most conservative party in the field, without thereby compromising such principles as are contained in the "Twelve Statements."

This is the nice kind of paradox which abounds in South African politics.

*(PROGS AND STATEMENTS —**Continued from page 5)*

Jan Steytler, while disavowing any claim to special virtue, was able to welcome the Twelve Statements and to show how, in important ways, the Progs strive to serve the ideals expressed in them. Mr. Vorster and Dr. Hertzog did not deign (or dare) to respond to them. And Sir de Villiers Graaff, wistfully, wished they had never been published.

Part of Sir de Villiers' difficulty, of course, is that these truths were published hundreds of years ago. In the Bible.

PARTY POLICIES

Before we examine the curious features of South African public life which makes this state of affairs possible, let us just spell out clearly the essence of the policies of the four parties.

The Progs say that if a South African has attained a certain defined level of education and/or earning power, he or she is entitled to full citizenship — a full vote on the common roll — regardless of race, sex or religion. To the recognition of human dignity.

The United Party says that no person of colour may have this full citizenship, but offers a sop to the non-whites in the form of about a dozen seats in a Parliament of a hundred and sixty. This minority is to be pegged unless and until the white voters, at a special referendum, vote to improve the lot of the non-whites. Distinctly and deliberately, an inferior status is thus conferred upon human beings of colour.

The Nats will give the non-whites no rights at all in the sovereign Parliament of the Republic, but will let them elect various communal councils of their own — impotent bodies except that one day, in the distant and uncertain future, certain of the Africans, though not the Indians or Coloured people, may hope for territorial independence.

And the H-Nats, so far as we can see, propose to give the non-whites somewhat less even than the U.P. and the Nats.

FAULTY CONSTITUTION

It's a far from cheerful prospect for Christians. Three out of four of the Parties, including the two largest, base their policies upon arbitrary withholding of rights from human beings, on grounds of skin colour alone and irrespective of their religion, culture, character or achievement. A coloured professor who is an elder of his Christian Church is to have less rights than any semi-literate white hobo — that is the plain meaning of Nat., U.P. and H.N.P. policy. And on April 22, most of the professing Christians in South Africa will vote for it.

How does this come to be? If a mere layman may presume to explain something to the readers of **Pro Veritate**, it is the fault of the South African constitution, which must tend to bring out the most selfish in the electorate.

In the democratic countries of, say, Western Europe and North America, the electorate is reasonably representative of all the people. Therefore, while selfishness is common and folly not unknown, the verdict of the democratic process will usually approximate to the general will of the people, and it is most unlikely that it could, in any sustained way, produce policies contrary to the interests of the population generally. **But in South Africa this is not so. The vote is restricted to the adult members of the white community, which makes up only some eighteen per cent of the population. This privileged minority, being of weak human flesh and easily tempted, tends to use its franchise primarily to entrench its privilege at the expense of the majority. That is why, for over twenty years, elections have almost always been won by those politicians and parties who shout loudest for the maintenance of white domination and white privilege, regardless of the effect this may have on the nation as a whole.**

Why else is it that even the United Party, regarded for years as being less racist than the Nats, now bases its appeal to the voters on the claim that it (and not the Nats) will most efficiently maintain "White Leadership" over the whole of South Africa? The fact is that the U.P. wants to stay alive and grow if it can. And it has observed the sureness of the racist formula, and learned its lesson well.

POLITICAL AUCTION

Christians had better face it. This election is going to be like an auction at which the U.P., the Nats and the H.N.P. will seek to outbid each other for the reactionary white vote. There will be precious little of an attempt to advocate decent ethical principles, precious little even of the real national interest. Only the Progs will be left out on their limb, pleading for simple justice and obvious economic wisdom.

The argument is sometimes advanced that it is right to plump for the lesser of two evils, to vote for the United Party on the ground that its chances look greater than those of the Progs. If the U.P. had any chance of winning, there might be some dubious force in this argument. But, of course, the U.P. can't win the election, and even if it did, we would simply have exchanged one form of racism for another — perhaps milder but still undesirable. We would only be selling our birthright of civilised principles for a mess of diluted racist pottage.

The voter who upholds Christian principles (or, so far as I understand these, Jewish ones, Mohammedan ones or Buddhist ones) should vote against racial discrimination. That means he should vote Prog (until a couple of years ago, he had the option of voting Liberal, but that has gone now). **This is not to say that the Christian leaders who oppose racial discrimination are aligning themselves with a party. It is to say that there is — most regrettably — only one party in South Africa, which, genuinely if imperfectly, strives to put into politics the principles on which our religious teachings are based. This, of course, is why the Progs have been relatively unsuccessful. They try to overcome prejudice instead of exploiting it.**

Every South African voter, individually, who can vote for a Prog and does so will be giving his personal witness against racial prejudice and discrimination. Everyone who votes against a Prog candidate will be telling his fellows, the non-whites and the world that racialism is O.K. by him.

Christian or not Christian, each voter should test his own principles against that undeniable fact.

QUEST FOR FULL HUMANITY

— DR. H. BERKHOF

The Uppsala Assembly showed a clear and unanimous direction in terms of action: the churches are ready and even eager to share in the great movement for the development of human lives and societies towards a fuller humanity. At the same time the Assembly was hesitant and divided so far as the relation between this development and the message of the Gospel was concerned. This dualistic situation has to be overcome, lest we lose either our social drive or the Gospel or both.

STATUS QUAESTIONES

Theoretically and theologically spoken, the problem seems rather easy: the Gospel of God's saving grace for mankind includes far more than the commandment to serve human needs but it does include this commandment too. In the Gospel the "vertical" relation between man and God and the "horizontal" relation between man and his neighbour belong indissolubly together, and "development" (as part of the total salvation which God wills for his human creatures) is under present circumstances a major form of expression of the love towards one's neighbour. Therefore the majority of the Assembly could agree with the words which Dr. Visser 't Hooft, in his address "The Mandate of the Ecumenical Movement", devoted to this problem:

I believe that, with regard to the great tension between the vertical interpretation of the Gospel as essentially concerned with God's saving action in the life of individuals, and the horizontal interpretation of it as mainly concerned with human relationships in the world, we must get out of that rather primitive oscillating movement of going from one extreme to the other, which is not worthy of a movement which by its nature seeks to embrace the truth of the Gospel in its fullness.

Nevertheless we had the experience during the Assembly that even this balanced presentation of the different concerns could not solve the tensions. In some statements these tensions have been hidden under vague words. In others, the cleavage between the two groups is evident. These facts are the more disquieting because the World Council of Churches since its very early days has confessed and stressed the unity of God and his world, of faith and ethos, of the two sides of the Great Commandment. It has expressed this unity in innumerable statements, some of which reflect profound common thinking about this

unity, as for example, "Christ — the Hope of the World" (1954) and "God in Nature and History" (1967). Nevertheless, we were not able to present our concern for human development convincingly in the context of a wider understanding of the Gospel. Many participants will agree with the careful evaluation of Norman Goodall in his "Editorial" to the Uppsala Report 1968:

The point where many would feel that Uppsala remained ambiguous or uncertain or where, at any rate, fundamental questions were recognised but not answered with anything like unanimity, concerns the ultimate dimensions within which the world and the Christian's involvement in it are to be seen. (One should read the whole important passage p xvii-xix.)

HORIZONTAL vs VERTICAL: ? OR !

The question is, what can we do after Uppsala to bring the groups closer together? Or would that be an impossible attempt? I am convinced that it is not. In Uppsala I met "verticalists", for example, missionaries who had given a life of self-sacrifice for the medical and educational development of the people; yet the most moving worship to me was the fast-service organised by the "horizontal" youth and characterised by a deep sense of sin and repentance before God. I know no "verticalist" who denies the horizontal dimension, nor the other way around. But their starting-points and angles of vision are opposite. What can we do to understand one another, and so to prevent the next Assembly from showing a reiteration of this sterile controversy? Assuming that in the eyes of the "horizontalists" I am a "verticalist", let me try to start where they stand and see where our agreements and disagreements lie. I will do this in twelve points which I hope, will cause others to formulate their insights too.

1. The concern of those who put the idea of revolutionary development in the centre of their conviction and action corresponds with an essential trend of the Gospel.

God's work has a revolutionary character according to the Scriptures. He is the God who does not acquiesce in the establishment of his sinful creatures. He is the God of the Exodus and of the Resurrection of Jesus, the God of Psalm 146 and of the revolutionary Magnificat of the Virgin Mary (Luke 1 vv 51-53). His Church hears and understands the groaning in travail of mankind and, by the Spirit which is given to her, she groans also inwardly and is thus led to a deep solidarity with the world (Romans 8 vv 18-25). Therefore the Christian, who knows about the new humanity in Christ, must always be a man in protest against the world as it is. No one should be more sensitive than he to all personal and cultural shortcomings in real and full humanity. Nevertheless the majority of Christendom acquiesces in the establishment, and what "sin" and "estrangement" mean in terms of social life is mostly far better understood and expressed by existentialists and Marxists:

The denial of humanity spreads through all achievements: it is in the daily preparedness for annihilation, in the equipment of a subterranean existence, in the ever more ingenuous planning of waste, in the inescapable inanities of the Media, in the abolition of privacy, and — perhaps the most effective denial of all — in the helpless awareness of all this, in public acknowledgement and criticism, which are impotent and contribute to the power of the whole, if they are not crushed and silenced by force. Thus the need for liberation exists: it exists as universal need far beyond that of one particular class. (Herbert Marcuse in *Socialist Humanism*, ed. Erich Fromm, p 117.)

Is not this the application of Romans 8 vv 20-22 to our present day? And what else can the Church of the crucified and risen Jesus do than join in this groaning and revolt?

2. Redemption through revolution is the work of God himself; but man is involved in it as an instrument of his renewing Spirit.

We may easily object that the liberation which Marcuse refers to is the duty of revolutionary man, whereas the liberation of which Paul speaks is the gift of God's eschatological redemption. But it is entirely wrong to deduce God's work from man's work or the other way around. The reality of the Spirit makes that impossible. The Spirit means that God works in such a way that man is inspired to work under him and with him. It is God who will make all things new, but into his heavenly Jerusalem the results of man's efforts, "the glory and the honour of the nations", will be brought. Therefore we believe that man in general, as God's son and representative, and the Church of Jesus Christ as the first fruits of God's creatures, play an essential role in the preparation of the Kingdom of peace and justice.

3. In human life and in the process of humanisation structures play an essential role.

The Christian Church has always put man and his spiritual needs in the centre of her attention and action, and rightly so. But in doing so she often forgot that, just as a soul without a body is a ghost, so man's personal life is borne, shaped and sheltered by the social, economical, political, juridical, and cultural structures in which it is embedded. A fight for fuller humanity has always to be at the same time a fight for more adequate structures. We cannot say that this truth was forgotten within the Christian Church. Especially on the mission-fields the Christians were very well aware of it, and also in the countries of Christian traditions much structural renewal took place under the influence of the Gospel. It cannot be denied, however, that the growing tendencies in Christendom towards individualisation and interiorisation in the last three centuries went hand in hand with a loss of structural consciousness. Sooner or later we had to make up for this arrear. This is now an urgent task which can only be fulfilled if some of us, as it were vicariously, show a quite one-sided interest in the structural side of human life and needs.

4. The present concern for structural renewal is an essential element in Christian sanctification.

If we ask what aspect of the Christian faith is central to the "horizontalists", our answer in terms of theo-

logy should be: the doctrine of sanctification. By sanctification in classical theology is meant the renewal of man's inner life and actions as a consequence of his justification by faith. It is usually described as a life of love towards God and towards one's neighbour. This doctrine is now at stake in a wider and in a way also richer sense. Wider and richer for two reasons: first, because not only the personal relation to one's neighbour is expressed in it, but also its social and structural implications; and second, because the bad connotation of the word "sanctification", as if service to one's neighbour would only be a means to build up one's personal holiness, is now completely removed. We can no longer go back beyond this wider concept. On the contrary, we must recognise it as an expression of the concern for the Christian calling to sanctification.

One could object that nowhere in the New Testament has this sanctification structural and world-wide form; but that would be a cheap argument. The situation of the tiny Christian congregations of the first century in the Roman Empire was widely different from ours. Moreover it is not for nothing that we have the Old Testament, with its emphasis on land, state, structures, prosperity, social righteousness and the life of the nations. The content of sanctification changes according to the "vision" and the vision depends on the width and depth of life and experiences. A concept of sanctification in the second half of the 20th century which would leave out or even treat as secondary the world-wide and structural perspectives of our present life, would be close to disobedience to God's call for the present.

5. Structural renewal needs a certain degree of ideology.

As long as we think of sanctification mainly in individualistic or at any rate individual and personal terms, any use of ideologies in our approach and actions may only seem a hindrance, because it prevents us from seeing the uniqueness of the neighbour and of the situation. Where general structures are at stake, however, we need general viewpoints to deal with them adequately and effectively. This applies even more when these structures have to be changed. In that case we need an ideology as a set of general viewpoints, aims and rules, to bring about effectively the necessary change. Christian faith inevitably puts limits on the renewal,

looks like an ideology of change. Marxism is the only relevant movement which has such an ideology to offer. No wonder that many Christians look for help from that side, particularly because this ideology aims at bringing man out of a situation of self-estrangement to a full realisation of his human potentialities.

For a large number of Christians the word "ideology" has a bad reputation, because such a power is in danger of becoming a more or less independent entity, a law which prevents us from hearing the voice of God every moment afresh. We will return to that difficulty. Here we have to say first that such a view underestimates the continuity of human life and actions, and that it neglects the fact that no man can live without ideologies. Ideologies are necessary to bridge the gap between mind and matter or thought and action. A Christian is not excepted from this position. In order to seek his way in specific situations, in obedience to the Gospel, he has to translate this obedience into what John Oldham called "middle axioms", according to his appraisal of the situations. For the Christian the use of ideologies can become an analogy to the work of God who incarnated his mind in a world which is not in accordance with it, and which therefore has to be changed. In the Bible we find different ideological layers. Church history is full of them. The WCC is led by two or three ideologies. Now that structural changes are at stake, the need for such ideologies is more urgent than ever before.

6. The mandate for structural renewal cannot be carried out without the help of other dimensions of the Christian faith.

Thus far, I assume, my position was in agreement with that held by most "horizontalists". They stand for truths which the WCC and the churches have to accept lest their presentation of the Gospel become inadequate and ineffective. But to my mind the same danger imperils the "horizontalists", if they do not seriously take into account the context in which the heavy work of structural renewal has to take place. To undertake it we need immense resources of self-denial and love. It is true, such renewal can also be nourished by other (good, bad or neutral) attitudes: class-consciousness, egotism, idealism, nationalism, resentment, competition and so on. But in that case, the source never has developed anything which

because this renewal cannot go beyond the interests of the source.

Only self-denying universal love is an unlimited force of renewal. But no one disposes of this source by himself. We can give love only to the extent that we receive love. That is what Paul expresses by his relation between indicative and imperative, and what the Christian Church officially calls the relation between justification and sanctification. In order not to fall into despair in view of the immense task, our own failures and the disappointment which our neighbours give to us, we must constantly be supported by the God of everlasting love, who accepts us with all the disappointment which we give to him and who never gets discouraged in his firm purpose not to rest until the complete humanisation of his world is attained. Therefore we should not say that we need "not only" sanctification "but also" justification, but: that we need justification because we need sanctification, and even to the extent to which we need it. He who is forgiven much, loves much.

7. But for this background, the demand for structural renewal may lead to legalism or to resignation.

If God is only the law-giver and Christ only the perfect example, we are the ones who have to do the job and we alone. Sooner or later we will discover that for different reasons we are confronted with an impossible task. The resistance of structures against change is tremendously strong. And if it is overcome, new structures are established which, though in a different way from their predecessors, likewise show themselves to be more or less repressive elements on the way to a full humanity. And above all: where man remains unchanged, new structures may oppress several of his egotistic instincts and habits, but his unrenewed nature always finds new ways to display itself at the cost of his fellow-men. So sooner or later we discover how impossible it is to fulfil the divine mandate.

In this critical situation we are in danger of assuming one of two attitudes. Either we continue to preach the law in a doctrinaire way, irrespective of the effects on unrenewed man; or we fall into resignation if not cynicism, declaring that it is not of the slightest use trying to renew the world. In both cases we experience the truth of Paul's words: "The law kills" (II Cor. 3 v 6). The Gospel shows a third way beyond these de-

railments: to continue in view of God's grace and promises, in spite of man's frustrations. "In order to endure, it is not necessary to succeed" (William the Silent). "The Lord does not faint or grow weary. He gives power to the faint, and to him who has no might he increases strength. Even youths shall faint and be weary, and young men shall fall exhausted; but they who wait for the Lord shall renew their strength" (Isaiah 40 v 28 ff.).

8. The primary task of the Christian Church is to call men to the source of God's grace and promises.

The Church has the task to preach the Law. But the isolated Law kills, whether it is a merely human or a truly divine law. The primary and specific task of the Church is to tell men, in their self-confidence and objection, that the Law is an element of God's grace and that God is ready to make these prodigal sons his children and to use them in his work, in spite of all their shortcomings. In God's renewing way with men, acceptance and instruction, comfort and challenge always go together, and always in that order. Karl Barth once said: "The message of true Gospel is not: 'bad men must become good men' but 'God is good for bad men'." We may add that this reality is the only atmosphere in which bad men can undergo a real renewal. All sanctification is rooted in justification. And also: justification has sanctification as its aim.

9. Structural renewal is not the exclusive task of the Christian Church, but the responsibility of all mankind.

We cannot formulate this thesis without deep feeling of shame. How often did it happen that non-Christian representatives of mankind were far more sensitive to the need for structural renewal and far more courageous in fighting for it than Christian churches were! We say this with shame but also with gratitude. God is not dependent of his Church; his Spirit works in the whole world. At the same time it is true that it is the church "to whom the Spirit is given as first-fruits of the harvest to come" (Rom. 7 v 23 NEB.). That makes her "groan inwardly" because the liberation promised to her in the resurrection of her Lord has not yet come. In this groaning she corresponds to the groaning of all mankind about the slavery and frustration of our present world. She recognises this universal

groaning and "the pangs of childbirth" of the promised Kingdom. God's general presence in His world is felt in this ongoing desire and drive for a fuller humanity.

Therefore we may expect that the Christian Church and movements for reformation of human situations will continually find one another. At one time such movements will go ahead and open the Church's eyes to situations which are against God's will. At another time the Church will see with joy that some of her concerns become part of the general human conscience. She cannot expect that this will happen to her preaching of the source of true humanity as realised only in dying and rising with Jesus. The unconverted world is not interested in the root, only in the fruits. But its deep longing for the fruits of true humanity is God's work in mankind. Therefore, if the Church advocates development or structural renewal, she may expect that sooner or later she will find many allies. This concern is not and must not be an ecclesiastical monopoly. The sooner it becomes part of the general human conscience, the better.

10. In view of the struggle for structural renewal and its possible frustrations the Church has to concentrate afresh on her primary duty (see 8).

What is said in 9 cannot mean that the Church can ever withdraw from the field of development and structural renewal. Her diaconal task can be taken over by general agencies, in which individual Christians will cooperate on the basis of their faith with all men of good will. But as long as mankind strives for renewal in disregard of the source of renewal in the love of God in the crucified and risen Jesus, the Church cannot be at ease about the results. Ideology can be an expression of love but if absolutised it becomes an idol and thereby an obstacle to true humanity. Ideologies must therefore always be relativised, that is, brought constantly afresh into relations with the ultimate aims, the purpose of God and the liberation of men, which they have to serve. Therefore the Church as representative of God's love has permanently to remind mankind of the divine context of its struggles, which has both an inspiring and a relativising function.

In Isaiah 45 v 18 we read: "For thus says the Lord, who created the heavens (he is God!) who formed the earth and made it (he established it; he did not create it a chaos, he form-

ed it to be inhabited!): 'I am the Lord, and there is no other.' What strikes me in this word is that the livability and habitability of the world is presented as a concern of God himself, but that this concern is expressed in a parenthetical clause. This last fact does not imply that we have only to do with a minor concern of God. On the contrary, the casual place of the sentence suggests its self-evidence. Every one can know that the world is not meant to become a place of chaos; not only Israel but also the Babylonians, not only the Christians but also the humanists and the Marxists. On the basis of this common conviction the principal clause has to say something new, which at the same time is decisive for a right inhabitation of the earth: "I am the Lord, and there is no other." This proclamation is expanded in the next verses. "They have no knowledge who carry their wooden idols, and keep on praying to a god that cannot save" (20); "Turn to me and be saved, all the ends of the earth! For I am God and there is no other" (22). Translated into New Testament language this means: The habitability of the earth is a common human concern, which is however continuously endangered by (conservative or revolutionary) idols and ideologies. In order to move on the right track we need God's renewing forgiveness which recreates us according to the image of his Son and his way of victory through self-sacrifice. A Church which would forget or obscure this principle clause would forsake her special mandate for the renewal of the world.

11. In the struggle for development and structural renewal the Church has, beside her inspiring role, to play a relativising role.

This can be illustrated by two examples of major importance. The first is the relevance and impact of structures. Marxism is right in that new structures have a renewing influence on man's behaviour. This was often neglected by Christians. But the Christian Church must warn against the present over-estimation of the role of structures. Otherwise she will make herself accessory to the disillusionment and resignation which will inevitably follow the present period. She has to stand for her own message: that a renewed world cannot be established without personal renewal, which God has promised to grant us through his Spirit. And she must say it now, for it is relevant now, because it is unpopular.

The second example is the concept of prosperity. The churches and the WCC have expended much energy in the last years on the promotion and the spread of prosperity, and rightly so. God may start with a desert, but his aim is "a land flowing with milk and honey". Prosperity is part of full humanity, which means that the humanity of God's Kingdom is far more than having a prosperous life. As soon as prosperity becomes an end in itself, and is no longer related to other and wider aspects, the Church has to exercise her relativising function. Then it is no longer her primary duty to say what every one else says already, but to remind modern man of both the centre and the wide cir-

cumference of full humanity: the conversion to God, the following of Jesus, the self-sacrifice towards our neighbour, and last but not least: the promise of eternal life in which God will fulfil all our longing for a true humanity. If the church were to keep silent about these deeper elements of God's purpose with man, she would pave the way for a brave new world of egotism and boredom. She has the choice between becoming unpopular or saltless.

12. The evidence of the Church's authenticity will be that she will be distrusted, successively or simultaneously, by the dogmatists of the establishment and those of the revolution.

A servant is not greater than his master. Jesus served and saved humanity by going the way of the dying corn and therefore by refusing to join the ideologies and the methods of the movements around him. He was not a conformist like the Herodians or a revolutionary like the Zealots or a legalist like the Pharisees. Christians are distinct from other people because they believe that only the way of Jesus saves, and because in spite of all their inner resistance they want to act accordingly. If they really believe that this is the way to true life, for themselves and for all men, they must be willing to pay the price. The history of Christian conformity to worldly attitudes is already far too long.

★ This article appears by the kind permission of the *Écumenical Review*.

*(REACTIONS —
Continued from page 4)*

Sir De Villiers Graaff, Leader of the Opposition:

Advised against publication of the document . . . certain passages would involve some signatories in their capacities as church leaders in party politics. (CAPE ARGUS, 19/1/70)

Mr. Jan Steytler, Leader of the Progressive Party:

"I am happy to be able to tell you that the Progressive Party is fully able to accept all the points raised.

"In saying this we should not presume to have any special claim on Christian virtue.

"Many of our members are not formally Christians, and all of us are

ordinary people capable of falling into sin and error.

"But what is true is that we have always striven to base our politics on sound moral principles and not to compromise these for the sake of expediency.

"In particular, we would emphasise our full agreement with the contention, implicit in the statement, that no person should be deprived of full political or economic opportunity on grounds of race or colour." (SUNDAY TIMES, 18/1/70)

The Rev. A. W. Stops, Chairman of the United Congregational Church (a signatory):

"I see the Christian Election Manifesto as a challenge to all Christian

voters and not as a party-political document." (CAPE ARGUS, 20/1/70)

Prof. B. B. Keet, former Professor of Dogmatics at the Stellenbosch Theological Seminary of the N.G. Kerk (a signatory):

"I subscribe fully to what is said in the manifesto . . . I regard it as important that all voters should read the manifesto — and they must think about it." (CAPE ARGUS, 20/1/70)

The Very Rev. E. L. King, Anglican Dean of Cape Town (a signatory):

"The importance of the manifesto
(Continued on page 15)

A. I. C. WOMEN HIT THEIR STRIDE

ELS TE SIEPE

They all started the same way:

How can we care for our old people? It is often they who look after our children when we are at work. That is why our old people must be decently clothed and fed.

We must go out to work all day long because our men do not earn enough or cannot get any work. We must leave our small children alone at home. Can't we establish a crèche?

How must we feed our babies when we have so little money?

My children are between 13 and 17 years of age. They cannot go to school because the schools are full, and they cannot yet go out to work. Give our children somewhere to go, to amuse themselves and to learn something.

We wives of ministers work the whole week to earn money for our families, and on Sundays we must be at the disposal of our parishioners. The members of our churches come to us with their problems, but we do not know what to advise them. Our church members are leaving the church because we cannot give them advice. Our task is too heavy.

Such were the problems with which the ministers' wives of the African Independent Churches came to the Rev. Beyers Naudé, Director of the Christian Institute of Southern Africa. They asked him if he would help. He and the Rev. Danie van Zyl—adviser to AICA (the African Independent Churches' Association)—decided, together with the women, that the best solution would be to gather all the ministers' wives and their women's organisations into one national organisation. Thus WAAIC (the Women's Associations of the African Independent Churches) came into being in 1967.

AICA AND WAAIC

Although WAAIC has its own board of management and controls its own affairs it closely co-operates with AICA. As one of the AICA ministers put it: "AICA and WAAIC have a relationship similar to that of husband and wife in marriage: AICA is the right hand and WAAIC the left hand; the left hand can do nothing without the right hand". The ministers' wives who are members of

WAAIC call their husbands "Fathers of Religion".

In 1968 WAAIC appointed me as adviser. The women made the condition that I could only attend their meetings at their invitation. My task is: to listen to the women and to try to discover precisely what they are after, and to point out to them possible ways of putting their plans into effect and to help them to make use of their opportunities.

THE MEMBERS OF WAAIC

The members of WAAIC belong to the poorest section of South Africa's population. Most of the women have enjoyed only a few years' schooling or no schooling at all. Many of them go out to work to earn additional income for their families: as domestic servants, as vendors of sweetmeats at schools, etc. They have practically no spare time, except Sundays. The women are mostly elderly and are already grandmothers who have to look after their grandchildren. Often the father or the mother of these children is unknown.

WHAT DOES WAAIC DO?

At the annual meeting of August 1968 in Durban — subject: "How can I help myself and others?" — the discussion went about ways in which the women could better serve their parishes.

Reading and Writing

The women decided that courses in reading and writing had to be organised as soon as possible. First, in the mother tongue, such as Zulu or Sotho, later in English and Afrikaans. "We want to be able to read the Bible and the newspapers and to find better jobs for ourselves."

A start was made with this project in Soweto (Johannesburg) and five women have already been trained as teachers of Sotho, Zulu and Xhosa. Five classes will be started in March. Simultaneously the teachers are being trained to lead meetings and discussion groups. Any woman who has had five years' primary school education can become a teacher. The women are most enthusiastic about this project.

Dietetics

In addition to the courses in reading and writing the women want to launch a project centring upon the following questions:

How can I feed myself and my family better?

How can I prevent illness by better feeding?

Can food be both good and cheap?

Where can I buy cheap nutritious food?

How do I cook this food?

Etc., etc.

Arising from this, further questions naturally present themselves, questions concerning hygiene, education of children, sex education, etc.

We have now also begun to draw up pamphlets giving advice on all these subjects. This is done in a workshop together with the women themselves. The pamphlets must be very elementary and will also be used as follow-up material in the reading and writing classes.

The Cent Fund

At the suggestion of WAAIC's chairlady, a Cent Fund has been started. Every woman donates one cent every month. The women want to use this money to provide for widows and orphans.

FURTHER ACTIVITIES

Twice yearly an educational week is organised by WAAIC, every time in a different part of the country. The women themselves decide on the subject. In April we are going to the Transkei. The subject: "How can I feed my child better?". Another such week had as its subject: "Why learn to read?" The purpose is that the women should impart the knowledge they acquire to their own women's leagues.

WAAIC maintains contact with many women's organisations throughout the world. Groups of women in the Netherlands have decided to adopt WAAIC women's groups. The members of WAAIC are surprisingly interested in the women of other countries.

We are faced with something quite remarkable. The Women of the African Independent Churches have given notice that they are no longer prepared to live in poverty and ignorance. They are firmly resolved to see to it that they and their children will face a brighter future. They have already taken a very small step in this direction.

Die Kerk Buite Suid-Afrika

— PROF. B. B. KEET

DIE GEREFORMEERDE KERKE EN DIE WÊRELDRAAD VAN KERKE

Die verblydende nuus dat die Gereformeerde Kerke in Nederland besluit het om lidmaatskap van die Wêreldraad van Kerke te aanvaar is in Genève met vreugde ontvang. Dr. Visser 't Hooft, erepresident van die Wêreldraad, het aan Dr. P. G. Kunst, praeses van die Sinode, die volgende telegram gestuur: „Baie gelukkig met u byna eenparige stemming. Mag God u historiese besluite seën.” In 'n verklaring aan die pers het Dr. Eugene Carson Blake, sekretaris-generaal van die Wêreldraad, hom hierby aangesluit. Hy het daarby gevoeg dat Gereformeerdes uit Nederland reeds jarelank prakties saamgewerk het, en dat hul arbeid groot waardering ondervind.

Voordat die Sinode met 60 stemme ten gunste, insluitende die stemme van die 6 aanwesige hoogleraars, en 4 daarteen, met 1 blanko stem, besluit het om toe te tree, is 'n uitvoerige diskussie voor en teen die Wêreldraad gevoer. Baie het daarop gewys dat lidmaatskap van die W.R. nie beteken dat die band met die Gereformeerde susterkerke in die wêreld, wat geen lid van die W.R. is nie, mag verslap nie. Die versoek is pertinent gedoen dat die band met hierdie kerke vasgehou moet word.

PRO ET CONTRA

Kritiek is uitgeoefen oor die politieke verklaringe van die W.R., o.a. oor die Midde-Ooste. Dié het nie genoegsame sorg vir Israel geopenbaar nie. Ook die probleem van die vrysinnige Kerke in die W.R. het ter sprake gekom. Behalwe gespreks-gemeenskap wil die W.R. ook geloofsgemeenskap wees — maar, so is beweer, dit is tog onmoontlik met kerke wat sentrale geloofswaarhede nie aanvaar nie. Dr. Kunst, praeses van die Sinode, wat jarelank al leiding gegee het aan die Studiedepu-taatskap vir die Wêreldraad (W.R.) het ten slotte die Sinode toegesprek. Nadruklik het hy daarop gewys dat as die Gereformeerdes die W.R. binnetree, hulle dit doen met 'n duidelike, gereformeerde identiteit. Trouens, so is hulle ook gevra om lid te word en nie om in 'n kleurlose ekumenie in te gaan nie. Uiteraard is daar besware teen die W.R. Maar is die Gereformeerde Kerke in Nederland dan so vlekkeloos?

Dr. Kunst het die lang weg geskets wat die Gereformeerde Kerke bewandel het vóór hulle tot 'n definitiewe besluit gekom het. Veertien jaar lank het die Sinodes hulle besig gehou met die vrac rondom die aansluiting. Daar was egter geen voldoende eenstemmigheid in die Kerk nie. Geleidelik het dit wel ontstaan, en nou kon die Sinode hom uitspreek. Dikwels word in die Sinode gebid dat God sy volk oor die hele wêreld sal seën — dan mag daar nie bygevoeg word nie: as ons met daardie volk in kontak kan kom.

RIGLYNE

Vóór dié vaste beslissing, het die Sinode besluit om in 'n latere sitting die oorweginge en riglyne vas te stel, o.a. vir hulle wat die Gereformeerde Kerke in die W.R. sal verteenwoordig. Ook wil die Sinode 'n kort verklaring na die plaaslike kerke stuur. Verder is gevra dat uitvoerige motivering na die Gereformeerde susterkerke in die Wêreld gestuur word, nl. aan dié wat afwysend staan teenoor die Wêreldraad.

Aangaande die aansluiting van die Gereformeerde Kerke by die Wêreldraad skryf Prof. Ridderbos onder meer die volgende in „Gereformeerde Weekblad” van 14 November 1969: Die besluit van die Generale Sinode om tot die Wêreldraad toe te tree, vorm die einde van 'n diskussie wat meer as 20 jaar in die Gereformeerde Kerke gevoer is, en nie selde die gemeedere in groot beweging gebring het. Dat dit nou, met slegs enkele stemme teen, geneem kon word, en

sonder groot beroering in die Kerk teweeggebring kan word, kan op meer as een manier uitgelê word. Sommige sal sê: so diep het ons Gereformeerde Kerke gedink, dat wat in vroeër dae met dieselfde of groter meerderheid verwerp is (Den Haag 1969) nou, byna sonder slag of stoot, aangeneem word. Ander meen dat 'n blaam op die kerke gewerp word, omdat hulle so lank hulle van medewerking met die W.R. onthou het, en dat almal wat vandag daarvoor gestem het, die kortsigtigheid van die teenstanders van gister nie meer kan vergoed nie. En nog ander — daartoe reken Ridderbos homself — sal meen dat aansluiting by die W.R. in ons kerke langsamerhand die sjibbolet-karakter (van „ortodoksie” of „vrysinnigheid”) verloor het, dat aansluiting, vir die oorgrote deel van die lede van die kerk, in 'n ander lig te staan gekom en meer aanneemlik geword het.

GEEN SUPER-KERK

Die geskiedenis van die W.R. self, sedert dit in die veertiger jare in die Konsertgebou in Amsterdam sy begin gehad het, het nie weinig daaraan meegewerk nie. Die W.R. is inderdaad 'n raad van kerke, geen super-kerk nie, ook nie 'n smeltoond om elke deelnemende kerk so spoedig moontlik sy identiteit te laat verloor nie. Wat sommige hulle ook mag voorgestel het van 'n eenheidskerk, die geskiedenis het geleer dat die W.R. hom nie in dié rigting ontwikkel het nie. Mens kan dit prys of laak, feit is dat Anglikane, Oosters-Ortodokse, Lutherse, Kopte en minder diep gewortelde jong kerke deur die W.R. nie tot 'n ongedifferensieerde eenheid saamgesmelt is nie, maar in duidelike individuele herkenbaarheid bly saamkom en op dié manier gemeenskap soek en saamwerk. Daarby het dit geblyk dat die W.R. nie alleen 'n buitengewoon belangrike ontmoetingspunt geword het nie, maar ook 'n onmiskenbare orgaan vir die kerke geword het om uitdrukking te gee aan 'n ruimer en met meer reserwes omringde eenheid dan wat hulle vir die duidelike en ondubbelsinnige opbou van hul eie kerklike lewe onmisbaar geag het. Hier word uiteraard vrac

en probleme ondervind, van eie identiteit aan die een kant, en die soek na 'n wyer gemeenskap aan die ander kant. Moet die hele wêreld nie in een Kerk saamgebring word nie (die eie dus absoluut gestel), of moet ons bereid wees om hierdie eenheid as 'n belemmering vir die eenheid prys te gee en net 'n soort van grootste gemene deler van alle 'eienhede' te soek? Is die lewe by die en (nie hink op twee gedagtes nie) en moet die of in die plek daarvan gestel word? Dit is almal vrae wat ook in die Gereformeerde Kerke gestel en op verskillende wyse beantwoord word.

Maar 'n mens kan nie sê dat dit die skuld is van die W.R. nie. In die fenomeen (verskynsel) Wêreldraad word hierdie probleem wel op 'n duidelike wyse sigbaar, dring hom met alle krag aan ons op. Maar ook sonder W.R. bestaan dit, tensy mens meen dat hy sy eie geskiedenis en identiteit waarlik kan verabsolueer. En dit kan nie beweer word dat dit die strewe van die W.R. is om die kerke tot hierdie gesigs- en identiteitsverlies te beweeg nie. Daarvoor is die W.R. self veels te veel 'n raad van afsonderlike kerke, nie die begin van 'n eenheidskerk nie.

GEREFORMEERDE TOEKOMS

Wat die invloed van die lidmaatskap van die W.R. op die Gereformeerde Kerke sal wees, en watter invloed hulle weer op die W.R. sal uitoefen, hang alles af van die eie ontwikkeling van die Gereformeerde Kerke self. As daar in hierdie opsig in die laaste 20 jaar iets verander het, skryf Ridderbos, dan stellig dit, dat ons altyd duideliker sien dat ons die ontmoeting met die kerke van ander struktuur dan ons eie nie kan en mag ontvlug nie. Teoreties was dit in ons kerke altyd wel die geval. Naas ons vasklemming aan die gereformeerde het ons immers altyd gewet van die „pluriformiteit”, hoe daarvoor ook gedink is. Maar die tweede Wêreldoorlog het hierdie teorie sy onverbondenheid vir ons laat verloor. Daarin lê die prinsipiële verskil tussen ons en die „Vrygemaaktes”. Wat oorbly is die vraag hoe ons ons in die ontmoeting gaan gedra en wat ons as ideaal stel. Dit werp probleme en ook onrus op. Maar daar staan ons, W.R. of geen W.R., tog voor. En dit is die eie probleme wat in die cerskomende jare beslissend sal blyk vir die toekoms van die Gereformeerde Kerke, ongeag hul lidmaatskap van die Wêreldraad.

(REACTIONS — Continued from page 12)

is its appeal to all who have a vote to vote responsibly and, if they are Christians, to examine their consciences in regard to programmes put out by the different political parties . . . They should put themselves, as far as possible, in the position of the people who will be affected by these policies and who do not have a vote . . . Every Christian voter is voting almost on behalf of the disenfranchised people of this country.” (CAPE ARGUS, 20/1/70)

Mrs. M. R. Henderson (a signatory):

“To me it is high time that the bulk of White South Africans should start relating their Christian beliefs to the situation in this country. It is high time they used their vote accordingly.” (CAPE ARGUS, 20/1/70)

The Rev. R. D. Adendorff (a signatory):

“(The manifesto) is an attempt by some members of the Christian Church to fulfil the Church's divine calling to prophesy; that is, to proclaim the Word of God in relation to the important practical issues confronting the people today . . .

“There is a generation of young voters who will take seriously the responsibility of 'the sacrament of the ballot box', and those of us in the Church who try to bridge today's generation gap with the gospel of a living Jesus of South Africa have heard these young people asking for some Christian standard of conscience and concern by which they may assess the proclaimed policies of the competing parties and sift the shouted slogans of the hustings . . .

“It is disappointing to experience again the phenomenon of 'Jerusalem stoning her prophets' in the form of prominent representatives of the churches actively opposing, or expressing indifference to, the manifesto.” (CAPE TIMES, 30/1/70)

Prof. A. M. Hugo, Professor of Classics, University of Cape Town (a signatory):

“I am deeply disappointed by the way in which the Moderator of my church, Dr. J. S. Gericke, has reacted to the Christian Election Manifesto.

“I also cannot understand why

other church leaders, who say that they fully agree with the principles formulated in the manifesto, do not see their way open to attach their signatures to it.

“I cannot understand why any Christian challenge to the political conscience of our White population should be treated with such contempt by a responsible church leader (Dr. Gericke).” (CAPE ARGUS, 22/1/70)

Dr. W. B. de Villiers, Liaison Officer of the Christian Institute (a signatory):

“The manifesto does not demand of voters that they vote (or do not vote) for any particular political party. What it does demand of them as mature Christian citizens is that they realistically examine the facts at their disposal, that they weigh up the various political policies — and their implications — against the truth of God.

“The manifesto demands of Christian voters that they stop indulging in idolatry; that they stop regarding party political policies as traditionally hallowed and sacrosanct idols, and that they start subjecting them to the cold light of reason and Christian morality.”

(SUNDAY TIMES, 25/1/70)

WEEK OF PRAYER FOR CHRISTIAN UNITY

The dates for the Week of Prayer
this year are

10 - 17th May 1970

It is hoped that this Week will be observed by Churches of all denominations throughout the Republic together with other Churches in the Southern Hemisphere. In the Northern Hemisphere the Week of Prayer is observed from 18 - 25th January, 1970.

The Week of Prayer is increasingly offering the opportunity of ecumenical experience and witness as Churches join with their neighbours to observe the Week of Prayer together in daily services of different types and in some areas holding a public service of witness on the final Sunday.

This year the Council of Churches will not be sending notices to individual clergy and we should be most grateful for your help in publicizing the Week of Prayer through your publication.

Pamphlets containing prayer topics for the Week can be obtained from the S.A. Council of Churches, P.O. Box 31190, Braamfontein, Tvl. at R1.50 per 100 in English, Xhosa, Zulu, Afrikaans, Tswana and S. Sotho. Orders should be submitted well before the 15th April 1970.

DIE HUIDIGE HERRIE

Hiermee bied ons ons lesers die eerste aflewering van 'n nuwe maandelikse rubriek. Dit gaan uit van die oortuiging dat ons onself soms 'n slag moet sien soos andere ons sien en dat dit sielkundig gesond is om af en toe vir onself te lag. Die rubriek sal om die beurt in Afrikaans en Engels verskyn. Aanstaaende maand dus: CURRENT CLAMOUR deur SIMON MEDDLER.

▲ Die nuutste politieke hoofpyn in Suid-Afrika word veroorsaak, nie deur dr. ALBERT HERTZOG nie — die wonder eindig nooit! — maar deur 'n kort vet mannetjie met 'n kaalkop en 'n breë wit glimlag: hoofman JONATHAN LEABUA, selfbevestigde Eerste Minister van Lesotho. En dit is ook nie net die politici wat met hul hande in hul hare oor hom sit nie. Selfs die kerke sit opgeskeep met 'n ding.

Toe hoofman Jonathan nou die dag merk dat hy en sy party, die Basoetolandse Nasionale Party, op heel demokratiese wyse die onderspit gaan delf teen NTSU MOKHEHLE, leier van die Basoetolandse Kongresparty, het hy die algemene verkiesing wat gedreig het om hom tot 'n val te bring, eenvoudig nietig verklaar, die land se grondwet opgehef en daarmee 'n klassieke staatsgreep teen die oënskynlik wettig verkose nuwe regering van die land uitgevoer.

Ernstig geskok deur sy diktatoriale optrede, sien niemand eintlik kans om dit te verdedig nie — behalwe miskien die Johannesburgse regeringspreekbuis, „Die Transvaler“, wat half-verontskuldigend, half-nukkerig beweer dat dit alles goed en wel is om demokratiese beginsels daarop na te hou; maar 'n mens moet darem realisties ook wees...

Aan die ander kant klink selfs die klein stemmetjie van veroordeling en protes wat daar uit meer liberale oorde opgaan, maar bra skraal en onoortuigend.

Want die kale feit is dat, hoewel Jonathan se bruuske optrede baie met weersin vervul het, niemand juis kans sien om Mokhehle as nuwe staats-hoof te verwelkom nie. Want Mokhehle is uitgesproke Pan-Afrikaan, anti-Suid-Afrikaans en, so word daar beweer, 'n beskermling van Rooi China.

Suid-Afrika wat sy eie tuislandehuis nie in orde kan kry nie, kan dit nouliks bekostig om opgeskeep te sit met 'n vyandiggesinde koninkrykie letterlik in sy midde, soos 'n klip in die maag.

Selfs die kerke in Lesotho sit in die pekel. Tot dusver nog was daar heel-

wat ondersteuning vir Jonathan van kerklike kant. Maar hoe nou?

Geen wonder dat almal op die oomblik maar met bra lang vingers aan hierdie turksvy vat nie en dat die Vorster-regering besig is om terug te val op sy beproefde slagspreuk: geen inmenging in ander man se sake nie. Maar hoe gemaak wanneer hierdie soort ding begin kop uitsteek hier in ons eie land, in een van die „demokraties selfregerende“ tuislande wat ons besig is om vir onself te skep?

Miskien moet ons ook meer realisties begin raak omtrent ons demokratiese manier van dinge doen.

▲ Op die Hertzog-front is dit darem ook nog lank nie alles pais en vree nie. Dinge word dáár nou uitgeveg op dieper, godsdienstige vlak. Besig om mekaar kaalhand in die hare te vlieg is die twee weleerwaarde seergeleerde eméritus-redakteurs van DIE KERKBODE, lyfblad van die Nederduitse Gereformeerde Kerk in Suid-Afrika: doktore Andries Treurnicht (origens Assessor van die Algemene Sinode en invloedryke lid van die Breë Moderatuur) en Willem Lubbe. Albei van hulle het onlangs langs kerklike kanale byna outomaties gepromoveer tot die redakteurskap van verregse politieke nuusblaaie. Ongelukkig gee die een (HOOFSTAD: redakteur, dr. Andries) voor om 'n spreekbuis van min. JOHN VORSTER se Nasionale Party te wees, terwyl die ander (DIE AFRIKANER: redakteur, dr. Willie) kwetsend uitgesproke aan die kant van dr. ALBERT HERTZOG en sy Herstigte Nasionale Party staan.

Twee harde stene kan nie maal nie en die breekslag was voorspelbaar.

Dit was dr. Andries wat begin het om skoor te soek deur dit te betwyfel of die beginsels van die H.N.P. met dié van die Calvinisme gerym kon word. Dr. Willie is egter self nie op sy mond geval nie — hy het immers deur dieselfde leerskool en voorbereidingskursus as dr. Andries gegaan — en het vinnig teruggekap deur sy eertydse geesgenot daarvan te beskuldig dat hy twee here dien.

Meer Calvinisties kan 'n mens dit

seker nie stel nie. Ons wag met ver-skuldigde eerbied op die volgende ronde.

▲ Van die N.G. Kerk en sy soms vreemde geestesvrugte gepraat: ons verneem uit ons dagblaaie dat daar groot onmin ontstaan het in die Malmesburyse gemeente van die N.G. Sendingkerk (d.w.s. die N.G. Moederkerk se Kleurling-Dogterkerk). Die gemeentedele aldaar is oa, daaroor ontstoke dat van hulle kinders op Sondagskool geleer word om die PATER NOSTER liever nie aan te hef met „Onse Vader . . .“ nie, dog met „DIE Vader wat in die hemel is . . .“ Maar goed dat „ons ou Bolandse volkies“ nie Latyn ken nie.

Wat hulle egter nog meer ontstel is dat die kinders geleer word om van die dissipels te praat as BAAS PETRUS, BAAS JOHANNES, BAAS JAKOBUS, ens.

Om die woorde van die Engelse trefferliedjie aan te haal: "Its a strange world, Master Jack!"

▲ Origen, wat die oorgrote meerderheid blanke burgers van Suid-Afrika aanbetref, gaan dit maar nog steeds, allerbelangriks, om sport in al sy, al hoemeer ontmoedigende, gedaantes. ARTHUR ASHE, die tennisspeler, is soos BASIL d'OLIVEIRA, die krieketspeler, voor hom, om politieke beginse'redes ons land belet. Gaan ons wêreldkampioenspan krieketspelers aanstaande jaar, soos ons span Olimpiese atlete voor hulle—en ons Springbok-rugbyspelers so byna—byna—eweneens die buitewêreld belet word? Gaan die Nieu-Seelandse All Blacks nog hierheen kom, en indien wel, met hoeveel Maoris in hul geleedere? Gaan ál sport wat eersdaags nog vir ons oorbly, wees om vrot eiers en tamaties op politieke vergaderings na mekaar te gooi?

Dit is die soort wortelvrae wat betref die toekoms wat ons so knaend kwel. En 'n mens kan nie help om jouself af te vra nie: het dit dan nie vir die Kerk in Suid-Afrika tyd geword om ook in hierdie verband 'n duidelike Christelike getuienis en profetiese leiding te gee nie?

SIMON INMINGER

LETTERS/BRIEWE

END JUSTIFIES MEANS

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

I refer to "Twelve Statements for the Consideration of All Christian Voters in the Republic of South Africa" published in your January issue.

If I had been invited to sign this manifesto I would have declined to do so for the following three reasons:

- (1) Because it does not appear to take into account the fact that many South African Christians are sincerely convinced that law, order and progress cannot be maintained unless a policy of separate development is enforced; the ultimate and long-term good being greater than any incidental hardships suffered by individuals or groups.
- (2) Because, in effect, it denounces the majority of Afrikaner Christians as bad, indifferent or careless Christians, and I am not prepared to moralize in this way over so many of my fellow Christians.
- (3) Because it follows from the above that the manifesto is likely to serve as an instrument of religious division at a time when all Christians should be seeking greater unity.

(We submitted Mr. Davies' letter to one of the signatories of the "Twelve Statements" — An Afrikaner — for comment. He replies:

"The implications of what Mr. Davies has set down on paper are quite shocking. What it amounts to is that:

- (1) *Because the majority of South African voters regard the ultimate ("not in our lifetime") end of separate development as desirable, we should not hesitate to employ the most unchristian and demonic means to attain it.*
- (2) *Because the majority of Afrikaners are in grave error, judged strictly by Christian norms, one must, because they are in the MAJORITY, refrain from admonishing them; the Church must refrain from prophetic witness.*

- (3) *Because unity is the ideal of the Church of Christ, whatever is still left of it must be preserved even at the cost of condoning evil amongst our brethren."*)

PRO VERITATE ONVERANTWOORDELIK?

J. B. Botha, De Korstestraat 117, Braamfontein, Johannesburg.

In u inleidingsartikel in Pro Veritate van 15 Januarie 1970 maak u, om die minste te sê, baie onverantwoordelike — om nie te sê roekelose, skandalige en nie-Christelike — stellings. U verraai nie net onverfyndheid met sommige van u woordkeuses soos „gemors” en „verfoeilike” nie, maar ek wonder hoe diepgaande u respek en eerbied vir die Godheid en vir geloof is, as u beweert: „Nie dáárin lê sy (die regering se) Christelikheid dat hy tydig en ontydig die hulp van God teen sy kritici inroep . . . nie.”

Ek wonder net of u rondslingery van beskuldigings dalk verraai dat u geweldig boos was toe u die artikel geskrywe het. U is ook nie eens konsekwent nie want eers beskuldig u die „magtig Ned. Geref. Kerk” dat hy die regering rugsteun, en net ’n rukkie later word hierdie beskuldiging tot die drie Afrikaans-Hollandse Kerke gerig.

U sê dat die aanvaarding van die redakteurskappe van twee ekstremisties-regse koerante deur oud-redakteurs van die Kerkbode vir baie lidmate van die N.G. Kerk erg onaangenaam moet wees. U het gelyk. Net jammer dat u uself daarin so verlekter terwyl u gemaklik vergeet van die groter hartseer wat bv. mnr. C. F. B. Naudé vir lidmate van die N.G. Kerk met ’n soortgelyke optrede (alhoewel net ekstremisties links), veroorsaak het.

Waarom roep u die N.G. Kerk nog tot verantwoording. Die resultate van sy werk tog, volgens u, bewys dat hy geen kerk is nie. As hy kerk is, as hy die werk van Christus doen, dan kán u immers nie die resultate van sy werk as „gemors” bestempel nie. Indien hy dan tog, soos u wil hê, geen kerk is nie, dus ’n sekulêre vereniging, waarom hom dan so onbe-

heersd uitkam en van hom sekere dinge soos van ’n kerk verwag?

Tereg sê u die owerheid is die-naar van God, en God is ’n aardse God. (Alhoewel ek moet byvoeg: Hy is ook meer as aardse God). Maar ’n paar reëls boontoe sê u die owerheid (of sou u in hierdie geval slegs die Nasionale Regering bedoel) mag hom nie (gladnie — want u sê dit tydig en ontydig) op God, dit is sy Werkgewer, beroep nie.

Ag, maar laat ek hiewer oor hierdie artikel swyg want u het immers slegs ’n spul ondeurdagte (of is dit moedswillige) nonsens kwytgeraak. Dit is nie eens in ’n Christelike benadering gedoen nie. (Gewoonlik die resultaat van onsuksesvolle politieke-ry agter maskers.) Net dit: Noem my asb. die presiese tyd en geleentheid waar die N.G. Kerk die (Nasionale) party voorgepraat het dat sy beleid eksklusief Christelik is en dat al wat dit weerspreek onchristelik is. U maak immers daarop aanspraak dat u en u geesgenote by „volle verstand” is.

Op bls. 9 van dieselfde uitgawe verskyn die s.g. Twaalf Stelling. Die groepie ondertekenaars is mos vir hulleself die klein Luthertjies. Waarom is die stelling nie teen die deure van Irenkerk of Groote Kerk vasgespyker nie. Hierdie klompie geestelikes kan egter gerus ’n bietjie moeite doen en die Bybel lees soos wat dit gelees wil wees. Die versoenningsboodskap in die Bybel gaan om die versoening tussen God en sy skepsel. Ek wonder net of dit hulle nog nooit opgeval het dat Christus tydens sy aardse omwandeling, te midde van politieke hoogspanning onder die Israel van daardie tyd, en klaarblyklike diskriminasie teen hulle van owerheidsweë, Hom nie uitlaat daaroor nie. Sekerlik nie dat Hy dit stilswyend goedgekeur het nie — maar omdat Hy ’n versoeningstaak tussen God en die mens moes volbring. Sy sending was baie hoër en heiliger as die ekumeneding van vandag. Hierdie hele Twaalf Stelling getuig van slapte in benadering. Hulle praat van waarheid. Wat is waarheid? Dit is ’n ou vraag, en tog: Die waarheid van die Christelike Godsdienst lê daarin dat dit deur God en van God kom, en nie

deur die mens, selfs nie in sy godsdiensdigheid, goedsmoeds gegryp kan word nie. En kan of sal God dit dan nie gee aan stemgeregtigde en stemlose nie. Daar moet veral gewaak word dat daar nie van die Christelikheid en Godsgenade politieke speelballe gemaak word nie.

Hierdie stelling sluit aan by die ondertekenaars se politieke pappery. Dit is bekend dat hulle algemene stemreg voorstaan en vir hulle lê die heil en die lewe daarin dat elke mens self sy regering sal kies. Hulle sê stemreg is die saligheid. Ek betoog nie dat dit by die Christelikheid totaal uitgesluit is nie. Ek betoog wel dat dit nie is waarom die Christelikheid en die Versoening wentel nie.

Ek bid ernstig vir hierdie "social reformers with the help of Christianity", dat hulle tog net mag sien, soos wat die Bybel openbaar.

(Die skrywer gaan klaarblyklik swaar gebuk onder die boosheid waarvan hy ons beskuldig. Die N.G. Kerk by uitstek maak nog steeds daarop aanspraak om ware KERK te wees hier in Suid-Afrika en stel hom gevolglik bloot aan kritiek wanneer hy, in die woorde van Prof. K. Runia, 'n onlangse besoeker aan ons land, sy profetiese taak versuim om nie maar net die status quo verlief te neem nie, maar om hom te bepaal by sy enigste norm: Gods Woord, en sy enigste taak: om allees in die lig van die Ryk van Christus te sien. „Die Kerk mag nie gewillig wees om die regeringsbeleid te volg asof dit die laaste woord is nie,” verklaar hy, „maar hy moet aan alle mense in Suid-Afrika laat sien dat die Christelike geloof en die Christelike liefde alle verskille oorbrug en 'n werklike, lewende gemeenskap skep wat alle

natuurlike verskille saambring in 'n hoëre geestelike eenheid.” (M.a.w. versoening op aardse, horisontale vlak!)

Ons kritiek teen veral die N.G. Kerk (juis omdat hy so magtig en invloedryk is, dog vanselfsprekend nie teen hom alleen nie) is nie so seer dat hy die owerheid voorpraat nie, dog dat hy so selde werklik teenpraat. Die Engelse het 'n goeie beskrywing vir hierdie soort optrede: „a conspiracy of silence”.

Origens is ons bede vir die skrywer dat hy die Bybel mag begin lees „soos dit gelees wil wees”, en dat hy nie in die versoeking sal bly verval om 'n regverdiging vir 'n steeds minder regverdige beleid en 'n verskoning vir politieke kragdadigheid (die antipode van „politieke pappery”?) daar in te lees nie. Red.)