



# PRO VERITATE

**JAMES A. POLLEY**  
Gospel or Ideology in South Africa?

**B. B. KEET**  
'n Noodsaaklike Herinnering

**CALVIN COOK**  
Family the Patient

**I. J. THERON**  
Moeder en Dogter

*Volume VII No. 3 | Jaargang VII Nr. 3*

*July 15 Julie*

# PRO VERITATE

## EDITORIAL

### EDITOR:

*Dr. B. Engelbrecht.*

### EDITORIAL COMMITTEE:

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

## ADMINISTRATION/ CORRESPONDENCE

### CIRCULATION MANAGER:

*Dr. W. B. de Villiers.*

*All letters to the editor and administration to: P.O. Box 31135, Braamfontein, Johannesburg.*

## SUBSCRIPTION

*Subscription payable in advance.*

*Land and sea mail: R1 (10/- or \$1.40) — Africa; R1.50 (15/- or \$2.10) — Overseas; 17/6-United Kingdom.*

*Air mail: R2 (£1 or \$2.80) — Africa; R3.50 (£1.17.6 or \$5.00) — Overseas; £2 — United Kingdom.*

*Cheques and postal orders to be made payable to Pro Veritate (Pty.) Ltd., P.O. Box 31135, Braamfontein, Johannesburg.*

## PLEASE NOTE

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

*PRO VERITATE appears on the 15th of every month.*

*(Price per single copy 10c).*

## CHRISTIAN MONTHLY FOR SOUTHERN AFRICA CHRISTELIKE MAANDBLAD VIR SUIDELIKE AFRIKA

Registered at the Post Office as a Newspaper

By die Hoofposkantoor as Nuusblad geregistreer

## IN THIS ISSUE . . .

- The Rev. James A. Polley says that the time has come in South Africa for a confrontation of the ideology of apartheid with power, namely the power of the Gospel. P. 4
- Prof. B. B. Keet writes an "imperative recollection" in which he scrutinizes the vindication of apartheid on biblical grounds and points out the untenability of the biblical argument in favour of apartheid. P. 8
- The text of an instructive broadcast on the family, which was held by Dr. Calvin Cook on the English service of the S.A.-B.C. on June 28th, is offered to our readers. P. 11
- The Rev. I. J. Theron of the N.G. Sendingkerk (Mission Church) expresses his concern about the relationship between the "Mother Church" and the "Daughter Church". P. 13

## IN HIERDIE UITGAWE

- Eerw. James Polley sê dat die tyd aangebreek het dat die ideologie van apartheid in Suid-Afrika met mag, nl. die mag van die Evangelie, gekonfronteer moet word. Bl. 4
- Prof. B. B. Keet skryf 'n „noodsaaklike herinnering" waarin hy die Skriftuurlike fundering van die apartheidsbeleid ondersoek en die onhoudbaarheid van die Bybelse argument ten gunste van apartheid aantoon. Bl. 8
- 'n Leersame praatjie oor die huisgesin wat dr. Calvin Cook op 28 Junie oor die Engelse sender van die S.A.U.K. gehou het, word in 'n artikel vir ons lesers aangebied. Bl. 11
- Ds. I. J. Theron van die N.G. Sendingkerk spreek sy besorgheid uit oor die verhouding tussen die „Moederkerk" en die „Dogterkerk". Bl. 13

## Editorial

*Without Wedding Garment*

While the Fourth Assembly of the World Council of Churches is now in session at Uppsala, Sweden, and the South African churches of reformed confession are not represented there, one cannot reflect upon it otherwise than with concern and sadness that something of Jesus' parable of the wedding (Matth. 22:1-14 and Luke 14:16-24) is probably applicable to this situation.

Whatever failings may attach to this assembly, whatever criticism may be brought up against discussions which may be held and decisions which may be taken there, however many sinful elements there may be introduced there by each of the member churches, we dare not lose our perspective on an event such as this. What is of major importance is that 223 member churches from the six continents of the world are assembled there through their representatives.

Such an assembly of Christian believers always involuntarily reminds one of Jesus' parable of the wedding. This also applies to every service of worship and every celebration of the Holy Communion. A feast is being held. And it does not matter who are invited. Upon enquiry it will prove that they were scraped together from all over the place: From the crossroads and the lanes and the streets and the alleyways of the city, a hotch-potch of bad ones and good ones, of paupers and maimed ones and cripples and blind ones. The Royal Host who has prepared the wedding feast for his Son, does not weigh the participants on the scale of his moral judgments, condemns none of the party-goers because they do not conform to particular demands of "doctrine or life". Only one thing does He not tolerate: When he detects among those invited to this "feast of sinners" (the worship service and Holy Communion!) somebody who, instead of sharing in the festivities, stands apart, aloof, communing only with himself, viewing the celebrating throng from a distance like a critical outsider and deciding that he either does not belong with them or they not with him. This is the man "without a wedding garment" whose attitude is damned by the Royal Host and who is condemned by Him to the "outermost darkness".

At an assembly of the World Council of Churches such as the one being held in Uppsala at present, it is true, one joint celebration of Holy Communion is not yet being held by the representatives of all the churches. That it will inevitably lead to it, however, and will undoubtedly happen sooner or later must for all believers be something in the nature of a certainty of the hope that is not put to shame. This does not, however, detract from the fact that what is already taking place there is a festive event at which, despite all difference of opinion and despite all lack of unanimity in many matters, Jesus, the coming Lord stands in the centre. Through their representatives 223 churches are gathered there on the strength of his promise, "Behold, I make all things new", jointly to rejoice

in it, jointly to deliberate upon its real meaning for the world in this era with its complicated problems, and then to return from there to exemplify and to preach with greater conviction and unanimity the hope of the world.

For indeed, the church's presence in the world is like the wedding of which Jesus spoke in his parable — a sign and a promise in its midst of the eternal joy, a festival of salvation in which, in a prophetic and exemplary preliminariness, something of the salvation which God has prepared for it, is already experienced. Precisely because this is so, it is such an — almost stunning — anomaly that the church has contradicted its true essence and the intention of its Lord over a period of many centuries through its internal dividedness and mutual dissension.

Therefore, although much will still have to be attained before the church will once again be reunited around the one festive board, an event such as the one taking place at present in Uppsala calls upon all churches and all believers to clothe themselves in the wedding garment and to celebrate together the festival which has now not yet reached the point of sitting together at the same Table, but which will and must ere long happen. For where churches and believers thus gather on the strength of the promise, "Behold, I make all things new", there will shortly be no one left who will not notice that it is the present Lord Himself who speaks; and no one also who, encumbered with whatever doctrine or tradition, will be able to resist his invitation: "Take, eat: this is my Body . . ."

And yet there are still today churches and believers who stand aloof from what is happening. Who — one wants to ask in amazement — who can still afford it?

It causes pain indeed to see such influential churches in our country as the three Afrikaans-speaking churches of reformed faith standing among the aloof ones.

One dare certainly not allege that membership of the World Council of Churches is a condition for the true church-being of a church and that this is necessarily what the wearing of the wedding garment of the parable means, but there is undoubtedly an analogy. The fact that there are churches which have seriously been considering joining for years but have not yet been able to come to a definite decision on account of objections which they regard as weighty dare also not be condemned without further ado as unwilling aloofness. Serious consideration in itself is already a form of participation, even though it still be at a distance. As far as such cases are concerned, there is hope, but no concern. It is a different matter, however, when a church self-justifyingly revels in its aloofness and furthermore compounds its self-justification by having nothing but condemnations, frequently malicious and vicious condemnations, to heap on a body such as the World Council of Churches. Then one realises that something is awry some-

where. Even greater is one's sorrow when one recalls that at one stage two of our Afrikaans-speaking churches did indeed belong to this community of churches and severed this tie for reasons of an extremely questionable nature. And still one would have to bear in mind the admonition of Scripture that one should be slow to speak (James 1:19) if these churches had given evidence since their lamentable step of having thereby become Church of Christ in a greater, more complete and more convincing sense. It is on this very point, however, that the greatest doubts persist. The witness they have sent forth into the world from their isolation has more than once been of such a nature that it causes no surprise that in circles of the same confessional family the question has already been raised whether a certain church in our country should still be recognised as a church.

We do not wish to utter a single word of condemnation concerning these churches. Thank God, apart from everything which causes one the deepest sorrow, there is still enough reason to believe that they belong to the Lord, despite the grip exercised upon them by strange powers (and here we have in mind especially an exaggerated Afrikaner nationalism and the ideology of racial purity as the most dangerous of these powers). As far as these churches are concerned, a thoroughgoing self-examination is indeed highly necessary. For this purpose they need not in fact start with the question why they are standing aloof from the ecumenical movement, specifically as concretized in the World Council of Churches. First of all — and this is actually

of primary importance for every church taking part in the ecumenical movement — there must be an internal renewal.

The basic question by which these churches find themselves confronted is whether they are truly **church** in this country: whether, in the midst of the circumstances here — which for many mean despair, a complete lack of prospects, suffering, despite all appearance and glitter of economic prosperity and material welfare, of political and social calm — whether here, in this country they bear in their own life the sign and the promise of the coming salvation, and in their witness call for an ordering and sanctification of society on the basis of this expectation. In a nutshell: They must start celebrating the festival of grace, of the hope concerning the eternal salvation, and it must be **seen** in them that they are celebrating it. They are not the handmaidens of a political party nor the prompters of its ideology; neither are they the watchdogs over the morals, the language, the culture, the white skin colour, the political interests etc. etc. of "the Afrikaner". They are the heralds of the coming Day who must already celebrate in a prophetic and exemplary way the festival of the kingdom which is coming into the world. They must be identifiable by all, but especially by the King himself, by the wedding garment which they wear.

And if this happens — about this there is no doubt — they will find that there is no reason any more to fear and avoid the company of any church or community of churches which are also clothed in wedding garments.

#### Inleidingsartikel:

## Sonder Bruilofskleed

Terwyl die vierde vergadering van die Wêreldraad van Kerke tans te Uppsala, Swede, in sitting is, en die Suid-Afrikaanse kerke van gereformeerde belydenis nie daar verteenwoordig is nie, kan 'n mens nie sonder kommer en weemoed daaraan dink dat iets van Jesus se gelykenis van die bruilof (Matt. 22:1-14 en Luk. 14:16-24) waarskynlik op hierdie situasie van toepassing is nie.

Watter gebreke daar ook al aan hierdie vergadering mag kleef, watter kritiek daar ook al ingebring mag word teen besprekings wat daar gevoer en besluite wat daar geneem mag word, hoeveel sondige elemente daar ook al vanuit elkeen van die lede-kerke daar ingedra mag word, ons mag ons perspektief op 'n gebeurtenis soos hierdie nie verloor nie. Die hoofsaak is dat 223 lede-kerke van die ses kontinente van die wêreld deur hulle verteenwoordigers daar byeen is.

So 'n versameling van Christen-gelowiges laat 'n mens altyd onwillekeurig dink aan Jesus se gelykenis van die bruilof. Dit is ook die geval met elke erediens en elke Nagmaalsviering. Daar word fees gehou. En dit kom nie daarop aan wie die genooies is nie. By navraag sal dit blyk dat hulle sommer oral vandaan saamgeskraap is: Van die kruispaaie en die lanings en die strate en gangetjies van die stad, 'n mengelmoes van slegtes en goeies, van armes en verminktes en kreupeles

en blindes. Die Koning-gasheer wat die bruilofsfees vir sy Seun aanrig, weeg nie die deelnemers op die skaal van sy sedelike oordele nie, veroordeel geeneen van die feesgangers omdat hulle nie aan bepaalde eise van „leer of lewe" voldoen nie. Slegs een ding vedra Hy nie: As Hy onder die genooies na hierdie „sondaarsfees" (die erediens en die Nagmaal!) iemand sou aantref wat, in plaas van saam te vier, eenkant, afsydig staan, in homself gekeer, die feesvierende menigte van 'n afstand af soos 'n kritiese buitestaander betrag en besluit dat òf hy nie by hulle pas nie òf hulle nie by hom nie. Dit is die man „sonder 'n bruilofskleed" wie se houding deur die Koning-gasheer verdoem word 'en wat deur Hom tot die „buitenste duisternis" veroordeel word.

By 'n vergadering van die Wêreldraad van Kerke soos wat daar tans te Uppsala gehou word, word weliswaar nog nie één, gesamentlike Nagmaalsviering gehou van al die kerke se verteenwoordigers nie. Dat dit egter onvermydelik daartoe lei en vroeër of later ongetwyfeld gaan gebeur, moet vir alle gelowiges iets wees soos 'n sekerheid van die hoop wat nie beskaam nie. Dit neem egter nie die feit weg nie dat wat reeds daar plaasvind, 'n feestelike gebeurtenis is waarby, ondanks alle verskil van mening en ondanks alle gebrek aan eenstemmigheid in baie dinge, Jesus, die komende

Heer in die middelpunt staan. Rondom sy belofte, „Kyk, Ek maak alles nuut“ is 223 kerke deur hulle verteenwoordigers daar byeen om hulle gesamentlik daarin te verbly, gesamentlik daarvoor te beraadslaag wat dit tog vir die wêreld in hierdie tyd met sy gekompliseerde probleme beteken, en om dan weer daarvandaan terug te keer om met groter oortuiging en eendragtigheid die hoop van die wêreld aan hom voor te leef en te verkondig.

Die kerk se aanwesigheid in die wêreld is immers soos die bruilof waarvan Jesus in sy gelykenis gepraat het — 'n teken en 'n belofte in sy midde van die ewige vreugde, 'n heilsfees waar daar in 'n profetiese en eksemplariese voorlopigheid reeds iets beleef word van die verlossing wat God vir hom berei het. Juis omdat dit so is, is dit so 'n — haas verbysterende — anomalie dat die kerk oor 'n tydperk van baie eeue deur innerlike verdeeldheid en onderlinge twis sy ware wese en die bedoeling van sy Heer so weerspreek het.

Daarom, al is daar baie wat nog bereik moet word voordat die kerk weer herenig sal wees aan die een maaltyd, roep 'n gebeurtenis soos dié wat tans te Uppsala plaasvind alle kerke en alle gelowiges daartoe op om die bruilofskleed aan te trek en saam die fees te vier wat nou nog nie die punt bereik het van saam aansit aan die een Tafel nie, maar wat straks wel sal móét gebeur. Want waar kerke en gelowiges reeds so saamkom rondom die belofte, „Kyk, Ek maak alles nuut“, sal daar weldra niemand meer wees wat nie sal merk dat dit die aanwesige Heer self is wat spreek nie; en ook niemand wat, met watter belastheid van leer of tradisie ook al, weerstand sal kan bied teen sy uitnodiging nie: „Neem, eet, dit is my Liggaam . . .“

En tog is daar tans nog kerke en gelowiges wat afsydig staan van wat besig is om te gebeur. Wie — so wil 'n mens met verbasing vra — wie kan dit nog bekostig?

Dit skryn voorwaar om sulke invloedryke kerke in ons land soos die drie Afrikaanssprekende kerke van gereformeerde belydenis onder die afsydiges te sien staan.

'n Mens sal stellig nie mag beweer dat lidmaatskap van die Wêreldraad van Kerke vir die ware kerk-wees van 'n kerk voorwaardelik is en dat dit juis noodwendig die dra van die bruilofskleed van die gelykenis beteken nie, maar 'n analogie is daar ongetwyfeld. Die feit dat daar kerke is wat aansluiting al jare lank ernstig oorweeg, maar, vanweë besware wat hulle gewigtig ag, nog tot geen definitiewe besluit kon kom nie, sal ook nie sonder meer as 'n onwillige afsydigheid veroordeel mag word nie. Ernstige oorweging is op sigself al 'n vorm van deelname, al is dit nog op 'n afstand. Wat sulke gevalle betref, is daar hoop, maar geen kommer nie. Die saak staan egter anders as 'n kerk hom selfregverdigend in sy afsydigheid verlustig en sy selfregverdiging boonop nog verhewig deur niks anders as veroordeling, dikwels kwaadwillige en venynige veroordeling, vir 'n liggaam soos die Wêreldraad van Kerke oor te

hê nie. Dan besef 'n mens dat daar êrens iets is wat nie pluis is nie. Nog groter is 'n mens se verdriet as jy daaraan dink dat twee van ons Afrikaanssprekende kerke eenmaal wêl aan hierdie gemeenskap van kerke behoort het en hierdie band om redes van 'n uiters twyfelagtige aard verbreek het. Maar nog sou 'n mens die vermaning van die Skrif in gedagte moes hou dat jy stadig moet wees om te praat (Jak. 1:19) as hierdie kerke sedert hulle betreurenswaardige stap laat blyk het dat hulle juis daardeur meer, vollediger en oortuigender Kerk van Christus gewees het. Dog juis op hierdie punt is daar die grootste bedenkinge. Getuienisse wat die wêreld ingestuur is vanuit hulle isolasie, was meer as een maal van so 'n aard dat dit geen verbasing wek nie dat daar al in kringe van dieselfde konfessionele familie die vraag gestel is of 'n sekere kerk in ons land nog as 'n kerk erken behoort te word.

Ons wil geen enkele woord van veroordeling van hierdie kerke oor ons lippe neem nie. Goddank, by alles wat 'n mens tot die diepste droefheid stem, is daar nog genoeg rede om te glo dat hulle, ten spyte van die greep wat vreemde magte op hulle uitoefen (en ons dink hier veral aan 'n oordrewe Afrikanernasionalisme en die ideologie van rasse-suiwerheid as die gevaarlikste van hierdie magte) die Here se eiendom is. 'n Grondige selfondersoek is, wat hierdie kerke betref, wel hoog nodig. Hulle hoef daartoe inderdaad nie te begin by die vraag waarom hulle van die ekumeniese beweging, en m.n. soos dit in die Wêreldraad van Kerke sy beslag gekry het, afsydig staan nie. Daar moet — en dit is inderdaad vir elke kerk wat aan die ekumeniese beweging deelneem van primêre belang — allereers 'n vernuwing na binne wees.

Die wesenlike vraag waarvoor hierdie kerke hulle gestel vind, is of hulle in hierdie land waarlik **kerk** is; of hulle, te midde van die toestande hier — wat onder alle skyn en glans van ekonomiese voorspoed en stoflike welvaart, van politieke en sosiale rus, vir vele wanhoop, vooruitsigloosheid, leed beteken — of hulle hier, in hierdie land in hulle eie lewe die teken en die belofte dra van die komende verlossing, en in hulle getuienis roep om 'n inrigting en heiliging van die samelewing vanuit hierdie verwagting. Met een woord: Hulle moet die fees van die genade, van die hoop op die ewige verlossing begin vier, en dit moet aan hulle gesien word dat hulle dit vier. Hulle is nie die handlangers van 'n politieke party en die voorpraters van sy ideologie nie; hulle is ook nie die waakhonde oor die sedes, die taal, die kultuur, die blanke huidskleur, die politieke belange, ens. ens., van „die Afrikaner“ nie. Hulle is die heroute van die komende Dag wat profeties-eksemplaries reeds die fees moet vier van die koninkryk wat in die wêreld kom. Hulle moet deur almal, maar veral deur die Koning self, geïdentifiseer kan word aan die bruilofskleed wat hulle dra.

En as dit gebeur — daarvoor bestaan daar géén twyfel nie — sal hulle vind dat daar geen rede meer is om die gemeenskap te vrees en te vermy van enige kerk of samesyn van kerke wat die bruilofskleed ook dra nie.

# Gospel or Ideology in South Africa?

— THE REV. JAMES A. POLLEY

One cannot but identify oneself wholeheartedly with the hopeful cry of Mrs. Dorothy Haupt, widow of the Coloured donor in the Blaiberg case:

*I am very glad that my husband's Coloured heart could save the life of a White man . . . it has altered the whole idea of apartheid. Now everyone can see that all of us, white, brown or black, have the same heart.*

As factual as the statement may be, it is unlikely that this six month old event or any number of them will "alter the whole idea of apartheid".

Why not? Simply because this idea has become an ideology in South Africa, and ideologies are only altered by the confrontation of power. I want to suggest that the time has come in South Africa for such a confrontation. It must be made by the power of the gospel — the power of Truth. This involves the power of moral example as can be expressed in various styles of life and action, as well as the power of (what Gandhi called) Satyagraha, or Truth-force; that is the latent power in the collective bodies of Christians committed to love in action. This kind of confrontation will be non-violent and direct, going beyond the paper protests of church resolutions.

## CONFLICT

The time has come for this confrontation because the ideology has been propagated as a gospel for too long. Whilst those that propagate the ideology as a gospel may deny that they are doing this, an examination of their belief system and its promises clearly demonstrates (as we shall see) the subtle but skillful way in which this is being done. However, the time for the confrontation approaches us because (and this needs no unmasking) the many promises of the ideology have been used to justify the extensive processes of dehumanization which it set in motion. Too many minds and lives have been warped and broken by this illusion, no matter how sincerely its creators believed in it.

Its conflict with the authentic gospel stems from the very similar offer of salvation and demand of loyalty it presents to the people. We therefore need to distinguish clearly between the authentic and the false so that we can reject the latter without delay. We can best accomplish this task by examining the two major characteristics of the authentic gospel and then study the way the ideology clothes itself in almost identical forms. These two characteristics are a definite offer and a concrete demand.

(i) The offer is that of the good news Jesus brought about the Kingdom of God; that is, God's plan of salvation for man and the world. See Matt. 4:23, 9:35, 24:14; Luke 4:18-21; Mark: 1, 14.

(ii) The demand is that man should make a decision — a commitment to the Reign of God and its implications. Such a commitment involves radical obedience to the Will of God. It is in other words an absolute demand. See Mark 8:34-37; Matt. 7:31f; Luke 9:62, 14:26. The demand is of course one of love to God and neighbour with no strings attached or any reservations (Mark 12:28-34).

The ideology seriously conflicts with the authentic gospel on both these grounds. It makes an illusory though serious offer of salvation, and demands a loyalty to and absolute acceptance of every facet of its program. The salvation it offers is universalistic and historical. It has often recommended its precepts as

the salvation of the entire world's racial ills. Its salvation also has strong racial-historical connotations in that the kingdom has come for most of the white group, but *not for the non-white groups*. Their salvation is contained in a Dodd-like realized eschatology. By this we mean that particular view of the Kingdom of God which suggests that just as the Kingdom has broken into history in Jesus Christ, but is yet to be fully worked out and finally established in the future, so it has broken into their history, particularly that of the Xhosa nation resident in the Transkei, but is yet to be fulfilled for them and all the others at some unspecified future date. This they (and us) are asked to believe by faith and *forced* to accept whilst they suffer the dreadful consequences of structures designed to give birth to this kingdom.

When confronted with the agonizing question of so much suffering, the apostles of apartheid, like pre-Messianic rabbis, justify it all as the unfortunate but necessary prelude to the coming of the kingdom. They go on to assure us that when it comes it will banish all suffering in terms of discrimination and domination. The "new age" will supposedly be introduced around 1978, and justice, unity and peace will prevail in this "new Jerusalem" at the southern tip of Africa.

*However, the Kingdom has been so long in coming and the suffering is so severe that one cannot but suspect that what is to be born is actually being rejected as a dead embryo by the womb of history.*

In this way the ideology usurps the authority of the gospel and challenges the reality of its offer of salvation. We will examine this ideological offer of salvation first. We note that it is based on two

utterly false principles. First (and in this article), that the salvation of the nations in South Africa is dependent on *racial identity and discrimination* as systematised in the policy of separate development.

Second, that the salvation of the nations in South Africa is dependent on *physical racial separation* to as large an extent as possible. In other words reconciliation between the races and so between men is only possible at a safe distance — that is via separation.

### 1. SALVATION THROUGH RACIAL IDENTITY AND DISCRIMINATION

Whilst this offer of salvation has many parallels to that of the authentic gospel, its major threat to the gospel does not lie in the false "sheeps clothing" with which it is adorned, but in the ideological "hold" it has on the people.

#### WHAT IS AN IDEOLOGY?

To understand this and make a meaningful response to it we need to answer the question: What is an ideology? So let us begin by taking a brief look at the nature of ideological thought.

Werner Stark, a student of Mannheim, the eminent social scientist and authority on ideology, informs us that ideology "deals with a mode of thinking which is thrown off its proper course . . . ideological thought . . . is something shady, something that ought to be overcome and banished from our mind".<sup>1</sup>

It is not quite the same as lying, for where the liar at least attains to cynicism, the ideologue remains merely a fool:-

Both are concerned with untruth, but whereas the liar tries to falsify the thought of others while his own private thought is correct, while he himself knows well what the truth is, a person who falls for an ideology is himself deluded in his private thought and if he misleads others, does so unwillingly and unwittingly.<sup>2</sup>

Furthermore, we must affirm that almost all forms of thought are socially conditioned, but the ideology has the further unfortunate quality

of being psychologically "deformed" ("warped", "distorted", "falsified") by the pressure of personal emotions like fear, anxiety, desire, greed or hate. In an excellent analysis, Stark goes on to show how ideas and beliefs are related to reality in a double way; either to the *facts* of reality, or to the *strivings* which the reaction to this reality produces. Where the former connection exists we find thought which is, in principle, truthful; where the latter relation obtains we are faced with ideas which can be true only by accident, and which are likely to be biased.

Stark concludes:

To borrow Theodore Geiger's simile . . . thought determined by social fact is like a pure stream, crystal clear, transparent; ideological ideas like a dirty river, muddied and polluted by the impurities that have flooded into it. From the one it is health to drink, the other is poison to be avoided.<sup>3</sup>

Here Geiger has put his finger on the difference between the ethics of Jesus and ideologies. The latter have scourged the nations in a variety of forms, each claiming to be unique — Italian Facism, German National Socialism, Russian Bolshevism, French, Italian and Chinese Communism, the British Union of Fascists, "McCarthyism" and now "apartheid".

Each of these ideologies says C. Geertz is:

*doctrinaire* in that it claims complete and exclusive possession of political truth and abhors compromise. It is *totalistic* in that it aims to order the whole of social and cultural life in the image of its ideals, *futuristic* in that it works toward a utopian culmination of history in which such an ordering will be realized (emphasis mine).<sup>4</sup>

#### SEPARATE DEVELOPMENT

There is no need to point up the parallels between apartheid or separate development as our own ideology and this analysis. They are glaringly obvious. They stare us in the face, and they are dangerous. For the forces that these aspects of our South African ideology unleash (i.e. the doctrinaire, totalistic and futuristic aspects) are serious forces which bend and break the lives of

people. However, what is most significant for us is the fact that the birth of ideologies inevitably involve the elevation of some relative value to an absolute.

In South Africa the ideology has elevated the incidental difference in skin pigmentation to an absolute difference in terms of value. This self-made absolute has been utilised as the basis of a system determining the entire structure of human relationships and pattern of society in the country. At this point some leading Nationalist theorists have insisted that the basis of the system is not pigmentation, but cultural-racial *differences*. Mr. Otto Krause, editor of *Newscheck*, has for example made an eloquent plea for this position in *Optima* of December, 1966, pages 171-177. He argues that these human differences between the various "nations" in South Africa have become the basis of policy since 1948. However, the substitution of one relative value for another, even if it is more relevant, in an absolutised ideology, makes no practical difference to its expression as we shall see. The only difference it may make (possibly Mr. Krause's intention) is to enhance *the image* of the ideology in terms of public relations. But it changes nothing in the arena of life where people are being hurt daily. Nevertheless, the argument is quite groundless when one examines the socio-legal structure of the ideology. It obviously rests squarely on racial identity.

It is most significant, for example, that it does *not* discriminate between the Afrikaner Volk and the English section of the population but lumps them together as a "nation" of Whites characterised by their pigmentation. *Their* particular cultural and language differences are ignored in the interests of *white* solidarity.

The Coloureds, as we know, are really an integral part of the Afrikaner people. The vast majority of them speak the same language, namely Afrikaans, and share much of the group's culture. At least thirty per cent of them belong to the three major Afrikaans churches, this being the largest percentage of any denominational commitment. The next largest group is the Anglican section totalling a mere 17.8 per cent. It is abundantly clear why as

thorough an Afrikaner as Jan Rabie speaks of the Coloureds as "brown Afrikaners".

Yet the Coloureds are segregated into a separate "nation" on the basis of questionable pigmentation, but are refused a homeland of their own. They have to share the territorial homeland of the white group but not the privileges of its nationhood. So too with the Asians, although the Japanese are accepted as part of the White nation for economic purposes.

### LEGISLATION

In this way the Government has retained the power to qualify its self-created absolutes where convenient. These and other such inconsistencies provide glaring proof for the correctness of our point. The ideology is clearly based on racial identity and the consequent system of racial discrimination and ruthless separation. However, if any doubt remains, this position is confirmed by the numerous policy statements insisting on white supremacy (in spite of the current verligte talk of "separate freedoms"), and particularly by the major legal instrument making this possible, namely the *Population Registration Act No. 30 of 1950*.

This masterpiece of racial legislation provided for the compilation of a register of the people of S.A. classifying them into White, Coloured, and Bantu Groups, with various subdivisions allowed for in the Coloured groups.

On 22nd March 1967, the Minister of the Interior said in the Assembly that between 7 July 1950, when the original Act came into force, and the end of 1966, 2,698,556 White persons had been classified: 8,890,626 Africans and 1,107,283 persons belonging to one or other of the Coloured groups. Proclamation 46 of 1959, as amended in 1961 provided for the division of the Coloured group into the various sub groups; Cape Coloured, Cape Malay, Griqua, Chinese, Indian, other Asiatic and other Coloured. Proclamation 123 of 26 May 1967, affirmed these divisions and so by-passed Mr. Justice Steyn's judgement of "vagueness" during January 1967 (cf. *Survey of Race Relations in S.A., 1967*).

The Minister went on to report that in some cases investigations had proved necessary because there was a measure of doubt; of those classified 48,000 whites were involved, almost 179,000 Coloured, 14,000 Malays, 27 Indians, 14 Chinese and 26,500 Africans (Hansard 9 Cols. 3405-6).

As from 1 August 1966, it became compulsory for all citizens of the Republic over the age of 16 years to be able to produce identity cards on which the racial group of the holder is indicated. Until then large numbers of people had apparently not submitted themselves for classification. Mrs. C. D. Taylor, M.P., said in the Assembly on 15 September 1966, that she estimated the figure to be about 148,000 people. They were borderline cases who feared that they might be placed in a racial category that would prejudice their social status, and lead to dismissal from employment or to enforced removal to another group area (Hansard 7 Cols. 2155-6).

As early as 1952 the Natives Abolition of Passes and Co-ordination of Documents Act provided that all Africans over 16 must register for a reference book which must be carried on the person of the holder. It is common knowledge that this system has been used as one of the key factors for racial control. These Acts clearly provide the basis for a watertight system of racial identity and lay the foundation for endless discrimination and separation throughout all levels of our society. As a legal consequence whites carry cards of privilege identifying them as white, providing them with a suitable white number which opens (magically) all the white doors into privileged white society, from education to freedom of movement and the franchise. This card will be replaced in 1969 by a more streamlined "passport" of racial security.

Now whoever does not possess the Card of Privilege is relegated to non-white society and second and third class citizenship, i.e. into the vast structure of social, cultural, educational, economic and political deprivation. Factors such as character, skills, educational and cultural standards are entirely overlooked in favour of racial identity. In this way the *Population Register is the architectural blueprint of the white man's salvation. It is his genealogical claim to birth and privilege. It is the*

*non-white's permanent reminder of second-class citizenship and subjection.*

Furthermore, it is an Act that has partially saved only one racial group — and for a limited period only. Maybe this was all it was intended to do. If so, it is all the more evil, for it cannot save the children of the generation that conceived it. They have only created their own salvation and damned the rest — including their own flesh and blood. The progressive collapse of apartheid in the economic sphere, in the lack of Bantustan development, border industries etc., and the escalation of terrorist activities across the entire northern border are sufficient writing on the wall for those who are willing to see! This sad ending is inevitable, for racism and consequent terrorism will only breed more hatred and violence, unless there is a radical change of direction, a rapid dismantling of the whole godless ideological structure.

### CHRISTIAN RESPONSIBILITY

However, in the meantime human beings are made to fit the structure, whether they believe in the promise or not. They are *forced* to break up families and marriages in certain cases and move to another group area etc. for the demand of the machine is ruthless. We are told (*A Survey of Race Relations in South Africa 1966 and 1967*) that an average of 240-300 appeals against race classification are lodged annually. Each of them is an eloquent witness to the personal humiliation involved. Names of sufferers that made the front pages like Sandra Laing, the two Dickson children and Ronnie van der Walt the boxer are only the visible tip of an enormous concealed iceberg drifting insecurely through our society — where whiteness or degrees of it spells security. And all this is to make the program work so that the promise may pay off for some.

In the face of these facts, any arguments seeking to deny that racial identity underlies all South African social and political structures must be seen as sheer casuistry. And it is precisely this reality which cuts right across the gospel of Christ.

The authentic gospel also offers salvation to all men: the genuine discovery of one's true self and the consequent reconciliation with one's



fellowmen. But it has nothing to do with racial identity and discrimination. It rejects it outrightly. The New Testament teaches that all men are of equal worth. It makes clear that what matters about a man is his humanity and not the colour of his skin, or eyes or hair, for that matter.

We need to state categorically that this Population Registration Act embodies a principle which stands in direct opposition to the Christian gospel. It is a contradiction of the gospel. Hence it is rejected by the gospel as a lie. It disrupts the possibility of accepting fellow human beings as persons; it outlaws reconciliation and forgiveness. It is a pseudo-gospel.

Let us be clear on this; there is no grey area here. It is as clear as daylight. This means that every Christian who carries an identity card or reference book classifying him according to race, is being forced by law to abide by a system already rejected by the gospel and which is an affront to Jesus of

Nazareth. Yet, no Christian need submit as if he is not free. He is free to act. The gospel of Jesus Christ demands that he proclaim *by word and deed* a salvation which frees man from racial compartmentalization and discrimination; a salvation which does not recognise a man's racial identity as determinative of anything about him. Every Christian is freed by Christ to proclaim this truth and is thus morally bound to expose the pseudo-gospel of racial identity as a means to salvation. This is our immediate and most urgent task if we take the gospel and history seriously!

Before we answer the "how" of this vital proclamation we will examine (in the next issue) the second false principle of ideological salvation, namely that this salvation is dependent on a system of racial physical separation. We will also focus on the consequent dehumanization of man in our society. In a third and final article we will assess the fundamental crisis in which

Christians now find themselves; the head-on conflict between the claims for absolute loyalty between the ideology on the one hand and the authentic gospel on the other.

At that point we can and must return to the "how" of the proclamation of the true gospel in South Africa, which is inevitably a return to our own Gethsemane and the consideration of "this cup", isn't it?

1. W. Stark, *The Sociology of Knowledge* (London, 1958) Page 48.
2. *Ibid.* Page 48.
3. *Ibid.* Pages 90-91. For approximation of the same argument in Mannheim see his *Ideology and Utopia*, pages, 55-59.
4. *Ideology and Discontent*, edited by D. E. Apter, (The Free Press of Glencoe, London), 1964, page 50.

(An abbreviated version of this article has also appeared in the *U.C.M. Journal*, June 1968.)

## THE WAY OF LOVE

I have been asked by a group of Christian people in another country not to obey the Department of Interior's injunctions for me to leave my diocese. The many members of this Christian organization have written to me to remain in Windhoek in civic disobedience to my adopted country and, in no-violence, to allow myself to be carried to the airport by the police: this is to bring the world's spotlight upon the South African Government's action in separating a bishop needlessly from his diocese. I do not intend to follow any such method in spotlighting what I believe to be unfairness and injustice to the Church. Would this type of non-violence reflect love for the country which has been my home for nine years? Would it bring greater love and understanding between its various peoples, between Whites and Africans, or would it only increase, not only the bitterness of the world towards South Africa, but also between its races? NON-VIOLENCE that

fosters hatred and misunderstanding is not of CHRIST any more than super-imposed force is of Christ — super-imposed force, whether it be of an organized army, or of random guerillas and terrorists. Both are of the same evil.

Any method that is not of love, is not of Christ. Any method that is not of love, breeds only ultimate tragedy. That is why the method of economic sanctions against a country, no matter how noble this goal, can never bring advantage to the people it would help. It is not a method of love.

Fortunately, just as hate breeds hate, so love breeds love. And love must often be expressed in what appears to be defeat — just as in the case of our Lord, crucified upon the Cross. He accepted non-violence as a way of loss, absorbing evil without transmitting it and hitting back. He chose the Cross because it was the only way left for him to express his love for all man-

kind, even for those who were crucifying him. Love can best be expressed not where is sweetness and light, but where there is an environment of hatred. We learn this in our Lord's example on the Cross, in his teachings on the Mount, in St. Francis' well-known prayer, 'Lord, make me the instrument of thy peace . . .'. It is in the darkness of midnight that God's lightning can best be seen. Only where there is injury can pardon be offered; only where there is doubt can faith be offered; only where there is despair can hope be offered; only where there is darkness can light be offered. Don't run away from areas of hatred and darkness if you want to reveal God's love.

(Extract from a sermon preached by the Rt. Rev. Robert Herbert Mize, Bishop of Damaraland, in St. George's Cathedral, Cape Town, on Sunday, June 30th, 1968 — on the occasion of his having to leave his diocese, and also South Africa).

# 'n Noodsaaklike Herinnering

— PROF. B. B. KEET

## AANLEIDING

'n Mens is van nature geneig om vergeetagtig te wees. My bedoeling met hierdie skrywe is om sekere dinge in herinnering te bring, wat dreig om vergeet te word, hoewel die tydsverloop nie meer as agttien jaar is nie. Ek verwys na die Sinode van 1949 van die Ned. Geref. Kerk in Suid-Afrika, wat oor rasseverhoudinge beraadslaag het en besluite geneem het op grond waarvan (tydens dieselfde sitting) eksegese (Skrifverklaring) ten gunste van Suid-Afrika se apartheidsbeleid gebruik is, wat vandag streng bevraagteken moet word.

Ek het die voorreg gehad om as gas van die Sinode 'n ereplek voor die verhoog in te neem en agter geslote deure die rapport oor rasse-aangeleenthede by te woon sonder reg van diskussie of van stemming. (Dit was algemene usansie dat die professore geen reg daartoe gehad het nie, hoewel ek ernstig daarna verlang het). Waarom die ereplek aan my gegee is, kan ek slegs vermoed omdat ek die senior professor inder tyd was. Geslotenheid van diskussie en besluit het nie lank geslote gebly nie, want die resultaat is gepubliseer en vind sy plek in die verslae van ons sinodes.

In die verslag kom verwarde begrippe voor waarop dien gelet te word, daar, as gevolg daarvan, uiters swak en onverdedigbare eksegese gelewer is, wat my genoop het om in twee agtereenvolgende artikels in „Die Kerkbode” te skrywe. Ek stel voor om met enkele korreksies van drukfoute (in die laaste gedeelte is selfs twee paragrawe omgeruil) die verloop van die diskussie te beskrywe en dan 'n voorstel te maak wat in die ernstige toestande van vandag miskien tot nut van ons Kerk kan strek.

## 1. VERWARRING VAN BEGRIPPE

As die verslag noukeurig deur-gelees word, sal dit duidelik word dat daar van apartheid in tweërlei sin gespreek word, nl. in politieke of staatkundige sin en in kerklike sin. Ek wys op die tweede paragraaf waar gespreek word van die verklaarde landsbeleid van territoriale segregasie wat in sekere wette vasgelê is. Daarop volg die m.i. onjuiste

byvoeging dat hierdie opvatting verwant is aan dié van die Gefedereerde Ned. Geref. Kerk, sonder meer, in 1935 in sy sendingbeleid neergelê, waar daar o.a. onder die hoof **Maatskaplik** gesê word: „Waar die Kerk hom dus teen sosiale gelykstelling, in die sin van daelikse omgang verklaar, wil hy sosiale differensiasie aanmoedig en bevorder tot voordeel van beide seksies”. Wat in die sendingbeleid van ons kerk uit territoriale segregasie gevind kan word, begryp ek nie!

En so gaan die verwarring voort. In **par. 3** waar gespreek word van die ontwikkeling van ons Sendingkerk tot eiesoortige ontwikkeling en selfstandigheid, word in dieselfde asem gewag gemaak van onderskeie woonbuurte waar blank en nie-blank doodtevrede was om te woon. Is dit ook deur die kerk bewerkstellig? In **par. 4** weer kom ons terug op die staatkundige beleid van selfstandigheid „vir elke bevolkingsgroep volgens sy eie aard en behoeftes, volgens sy eie verlede en toekoms”. In **par. 5** word selfs die posisie van die Kleurlinggroep teenoor die naturel en die Asiaat bepaal. Maar die ergste verwarring kom nog. As daar oor die Skriftuurlike grond gespreek word (dit word later behandel) besluit die rapport met woorde wat ek hier letterlik weergee: „As 'n boom aan sy vrugte geken word en daar gelet word op die geseënde vrugte van bogenoemde beleid, soos deur ons kerk (en ook deur Engelse en Duitse kerkgenootskappe in hierdie land) die afgelope honderd jaar toegepas is in die belang van die koninkryk van God en die bevordering van gesonde rasseverhoudinge in ons land, dan is u kommissie oortuig dat hierdie beleidsrigting onder die leiding van die Heilige Gees gevorm en sover gevolg is, en dat dit op die weg van Gods wil lê. Op **natuurlike** wyse (ek onderstreep) en met inagneming van die welsyn van blank en nie-blank het ons vaders en ons met 'n rein gewete voor God en oortuig dat ons nie teen die gees van Christus en die Heilige Gees gehandel het nie, **op vreedsame wyse met onderlinge toestemming** (ek onderstreep) en ook om praktiese redes hierdie beleid toegepas. So is aan elke seksie op sy eie gebied geleentheid gegee tot altyd

groter selfstandigheid te ontwikkel. God het ons beleid en werk geseën en dit sterk ons om langs hierdie weg voort te gaan tot die eer van God, die bevordering van sy ryk en die geluk en seën van sowel blank as nie-blank in hierdie land”.

Hier praat u, my broeders, oor kerklike apartheid en verwar dit met politieke of staatsapartheid wat met geen vlug van die verbeelding daarmee vereenselwig kan word nie. Dié onderskeiding van begrippe is uiters belangrik in sake wat misverstand en verwydering bring. Ek glo nie dat daar enige grief onder die lede van ons sendingkerk bestaan teen die feit dat hulle in 'n eie kerkformasie leef nie (miskien moet die Hervormde Kerk van Afrika hier uitgesonder word) want dáár het dit tot 'n kragtige kerklike ontwikkeling gekom wat nie moontlik sou gewees het as hulle in die blanke gemeentes gebly het nie. Maar hulle grief is dat die Ned. Geref. Kerk die politieke beleid van apartheid, met al sy teleurstelling en leed, goedkeur en ondersteun, en dit selfs met die Heilige Skrif wil regverdig. Die een tog is vrywillig en sluit niemand uit nie; die ander is geforseerd en set die deur op slot en grendel.

## 2. ONVERDEDIGBARE SKRIFUITLEG

Dit bring my tot tipiese voorbeelde van swakke, onverdedigbare Skrifuitleg, wat die direkte gevolg is van voorgaande verwarring van begrippe. (Daar is meer voorbeelde, maar ons het nie ruimte om almal te behandel nie.) Voorop moet egter twee noodsaaklike opmerkinge gemaak word met betrekking tot die wyse waarop die Skrif benader en gebruik moet word.

Die eerste opmerking is dat dit uiters gevaarlik is om van die bestaande praktyk (in hierdie geval die verklaarde beleid van apartheid) uit te gaan en dan die Skrif te raadpleeg om daardie praktyk te bevestig. As ons in die Bybel gaan soek na die bevestiging van 'n vooropgesette mening sal ons dit waarskynlik daar vind, omdat 'n mens maar al te geneig is om te rasionaliseer, d.w.s. sy vooringenome standpunt agterna te wil regverdig; maar op dié manier

sal ons nie die Woord van God daarin vind nie. As ons die boodskap van die Skrif wil verstaan, moet ons ons sonder voorbehoud direk tot die Skrif wend en dan in ooreenstemming met die hele strekking van die Skrif probeer verneem wat daar op 'n bepaalde plek aan ons gesê word, sodat die praktyk in ooreenstemming met die Skrif gebring kan word en nie die Skrif aan die praktyk gebind word nie. Die gesag van Gods Woord eis dit van ons, anders trek ons sy Woord af tot die eise van wat ons noodsaaklik ag.

Ek hoef nie daaraan te herinner nie dat daar baie maniere is om die Skrif te gebruik, lettelik te gebruik en tog verkeerd te gebruik. Die Satan het ook by geleentheid die Skrif vir sy eie doeleindes gebruik.

Die tweede opmerking is dat die Skrif hom nie leen tot direkte uitsprake oor nasionale, biologiese ekonomiese, kulturele en dergelike natuurverskynsels nie, omdat die Skrif met 'n bepaalde doel aan ons gegee is, nl. om wys te maak tot saligheid (II Tim. 3:15). Daarom lig die Skrif ons nie in oor biologiese, nasionale en kulturele vraagstukke nie. Anders sou ons iets moet verwag aangaande die eeue-oue beskawing van die Chinese, om nie eens te praat van die talryke swart rasse nie — in die Bybel is daar selfs geen enkele woord oor kleurverskille nie. Maar die geskiedenis wat die Skrif gee, is geen algemene of kultuurgeskiedenis nie, dog heilsgeskiedenis. Veel word daarvan gemaak dat Israel altyd gewaarsku is om hom van die nasies rondom hom afgesonderd en rein te hou, d.w.s. sy nasionaliteit ongeskonde te bewaar, maar dit hang saam met sy besondere godsdienstige roeping. Dit was nie omdat sy nasionale bestaan op sigself van soveel betekenis was nie, maar omdat aan Israel, die uitverkore volk, die openbaring van die ware God toevertrou was. Sy nasionale bestaan het onlosmaaklik saamgehang met sy godsdienstige roeping, daarom was sy nasionale wette ook godsdienstige wette. Indien Israel as volk ondergegaan het, sou die ware godsdiens van die aarde verdwyn het, want nie alleen is aan Israel die ware kennis van God toevertrou nie, maar uit Israel het die Christus voortgekom. Die aanraking van Israel met die volke rondom hom moet altyd uit hierdie gesigspunt gesien word: dit was om die gevaar van sonde en afval wat gedurig gedreig het in hul verhouding as

bondsvolk tot die heidense nasies dat daar so 'n skerpe skeidslyn tussen hulle en die omliggende volke getrek is. Dit is die teenstelling van die ryk van God teenoor die ryk van die Satan wat hier betekenis het. Israel kan dus nie, sonder meer, met enige ander volk vergelyk word nie; hy het sy besondere roeping gehad vir die geskiedenis van die openbaring. Met die koms van Christus het daardie skeidslyne wat die verhouding van Israel tot die volke noodsaaklik gemaak het, totaal verdwyn. Let op, ek sê nie dat die volke nou hul selfstandigheid prysgegee of hul identiteit verloor het nie, maar die mure van afskeiding wat alle aanraking met Israel verbied het, is tot die grond toe afgebreek; in Christus Jesus is daar geen Griek en Jood, besnedene en onbesnedene, barbaar, Scith, slaaf en vryman nie. Almal is voor God gelykwaardig; die middelmuur van skeiding is afgebreek (Ef. 2:14).

Die kommissie verklaar dat hulle niks in die letter of gees van die Ou en Nuwe Testament vind wat in stryd is met hierdie beleid van afsonderlike eiesoortige ontwikkeling tot selfstandigheid nie. Dit hang alles af van wat met afsonderlike ontwikkeling bedoel word. Is die bedoeling: afgesonder, geskei van, soos dit in die hele verband moet gelees word, dan is dit in stryd met alles waarvoor die evangelieboodskap, in Ou en Nuwe Testament albei staan.

### 3. VOORBEELDE

Ek gaan nou daartoe oor om deur enkele voorbeelde aan te toon waarheen ons Skrifverklaring lei as van die regte uitgangspunt nie uitgegaan word nie.

(a) **Hand. 17:26.** Vireers die uitspraak van die apostel Paulus in sy rede op die Areopagus in Athene „dat God uit een bloed al die nasies van die mensdom gemaak het om oor die hele aarde te woon **terwyl Hy vooraf bepaalde tye en grense van hulle woonplek vasgestel het.**” (Hand. 17:26 — Die onderstreping is van die kommissie). Niemand wat nie van die veronderstelling van apartheid uitgegaan het, sou in die verste verte daaraan gedink het om die klem op die laaste deel van hierdie uitspraak te laat val nie. Die duidelike betekenis is tog dat die mensdom 'n eenheid is al woon hy in bepaalde afgebakende plekke, wat ongetwyfeld deur God gewil is, maar wat nie beteken dat hulle geen omgang met

mekaar moet hê nie. Onderskeiding beteken nie skeiding nie — lees maar I Kor. 12.

(b) **Man en Vrou (Gal. 3:28).**

Die verslag maak hom veral sterk oor die uitdrukking „man en vrou” in Gal. 3:28. Laat ek die hele redenering aanhaal: „Daar is nie meer Jood of Griek nie, daar is nie meer slaaf of vryman nie, daar is nie meer man en vrou nie, en bedoel dan alleen 'n **geestelike** eenheid, (onderstreping weer van die kommissie)—daarom dat hy ook kan sê: nie meer man en vrou nie”. En dit om apartheid te steun! Ek glo nie dat dit nog ooit in die hart van 'n mens opgekom het om te beweer dat die Jood opgehou het om 'n Jood te wees, die Griek om 'n Griek te wees, selfs die slaaf om slaaf te wees (want die slawerny was nog, teen die evangelie, honderde jare daarna in swang) of die man en vrou om man en vrou te wees nie. Maar moet die man dan nou van die vrou geskei word? Is die huwelik dan slegs 'n platoniese verbinding? Ek vrees hierdie redenering sal eg-skeiding in die hand werk! Alle korswil opsy — verstaan ons dan nie dat die Apostel hier juis wil sê dat alle skeidslyne (ek sê nie onderskeidinge nie) uitgewis is nie? Sonder Christus het die Griek, die slaaf, die vrou, wat hul godsdienstige posisie en ander regte betref, afgesonderd en ondergeskik gestaan, maar in Christus is ons almal een. En dan nog daardie pynlike uitdrukking dat Paulus alleen 'n **geestelike** eenheid bedoel! Is die geestelike dan nou net geestelik en sluit dit nie die hele lewe in nie? Ook in verband met man en vrou „alleen geestelik” en verder apart? Ons sien waarheen sulke Skrifgebruik 'n mens lei.

(c) **Die Vrou by die Put van Sigar (Joh. 4).** Dan kom ons by een van die treffendste gebeurtenisse in die Nuwe Testament, nl. die ontmoeting van Jesus met die Samaritaanse vrou by die put van Sigar. (Joh. 4). As daar ooit 'n gedeelte van die Skrif was wat net die teenoorgestelde verklaring het as wat die verslag daaraan gee, dan is dit hierdie gedeelte. 'n Mens sou sê, hier het Jesus so duidelik as moontlik laat sien dat die mure van afskeiding tussen Jood en Samaritaan geen reg van bestaan het nie. Maar nee, dit moet dan om apartheid te steun! Om die agtergrond van hierdie interpretasie te vind, moet ons verwys na die geskrif „**Apartheid en Voogdyskap in die lig van die Skrif**” uit die versamelwerk van G. Cronjé,

**Regverdige Rasse-apartheid**, wat met toestemming in die Rapport opgeneem is. Daar staan geskrywe: „Die sosiale skeiding tussen die volke word deur Jesus Christus aanvaar. Hy doen geen uitspraak om bv. die sosiale verkeer tussen die Jode en Samaritane tot stand te bring nie en gebruik die bestaande skeiding tussen Jood en heiden as beeld van die skeiding tussen die gelowige en die verharde sondaar”. En die daad van Christus dan? Spreek dit nie veel sterker as enige woord wat Hy kon geuit het nie? Hy wat 'n Jood is (tussen Jood en Samaritaan was daar 'n skeiding groter as tussen mense onder enige apartheidsbeleid) spreek met 'n Samaritaanse vrou oor die mees intieme verhouding van haar lewe. Sê dit vir die leser niks?

(d) **Petrus en Cornelius (Handelinge 10)**. Ook die geval van Petrus word genoem waar hy op pad is na Cornelius en as Jood selfs die huis van die heiden nie wou ingaan nie maar deur die Heilige Gees geleer is „dat ter wille van die evangelie 'n sekere sosiale omgang geoorloof was”.

Waar kom hierdie gedagte van beperkte sosiale omgang vandaan? Het Paulus dan nie by geleentheid Petrus berispe omdat hy juis op hierdie punt geveins het nie? (Gal. 2:11, 12). Hoor die konklusie waartoe hierdie redenering lei: „'n Onbeperkte sosiale omgang met mense wat nie tot jou gemeenskap behoort nie strek tot geestelike en sedelike skade. So 'n verkeer mag dan slegs in belang van die evangelie van Christus wees” (bl. 53, 54) Kan dit nou meer! Ek twyfel of 'n mens êrens 'n beter voorbeeld van Skrifverklaring kan vind wat aangepas is by heersende praktyk. Waar daar gesê word dat 'n sekere sosiale omgang ter wille van die evangelie geoorloof is, sou 'n mens die vraag kan stel: Verkondig alleen die ampsdraer-sendeling dan die evangelie en is ons nie almal getuies van die evangelie nie? Die verklaring dat onbeperkte sosiale omgang met mense wat nie tot jou eie gemeenskap behoort nie tot sedelike en geestelike skade strek, is alleen dan juis wanneer ons daardie gemeenskap as 'n geloofsgemeenskap verstaan en nie as 'n rassegemeenskap nie.

#### 4. WAT MOET GEDOEN WORD?

Op hierdie losse sandgrond is ons verklaarde beleid van apartheid gebou. As daar nog in ons kerk een of ander is wat die bogaande Skrifverklaring (eksegese) onderskryf, dan kry ek hom jammer. Hy het in byna 20 jaar op een plek in sy teologiese ontwikkeling bly staan, en vind hom in geselskap van 'n klompie fundamentaliste uit die „deep South” van Amerika wat nou nog glo dat slawerny deur die Bybel geleer word. Hy is uit pas met die hele Christelike Kerk (gereformeerde, metodisties of andersins). Wat moet dan gedoen word? In een woord, moet kerklike apartheid losgemaak word van alle politieke of staatkundige apartheid, dan verdwyn die meeste van ons moeilikhede en ons kan saamwerk om die belange van Gods Koninkryk; die kerk moet hom nie laat lei deur ander instansies nie maar hy moet die weg aanwys vir andere.

*Hierdie artikel sal eersdaags ook in Die Kerkbode verskyn.*

## Faith and Mathematics!

What we believe about God does not alter His nature by one jot. It affects what WE do but not what God does, although our limitations in understanding His nature hinders His work of redemption of the World.

A humbling example of how our belief about something, or our lack of understanding can close our eyes to further truth, is contained in the following mathematical model. Cut 3" off the bottom of a newspaper, join the two ends and if you cut the result lengthwise down the centre, you get 2 paper rings. Now take another 3" strip and before joining the two ends, give the paper a half-twist, and then join them. Now by cutting the paper lengthwise down the centre, what do you get? If you *think* you know, try it. (If you DO

know, then do you know what you get if you cut round 1/3 (one third) from the edge, continuing until you get back to the beginning?)

If you are stunned by what you find and consider how wrong one can be about a simple thing like the nature of a strip of paper, think how wrong we can be over the nature of God, if we limit Him either by our own experience of Him, or by what we have been taught.

God is trying to 'get through' to us, but our preconceived training in theology and our inherited Christian doctrines from whatever church hinders the lesson He wants us to learn. For God to achieve unity, not only amongst Christians, but in the world at large, may need only a simple 'twist' in ourselves - something which

is so simple and yet so absolutely fundamental that we are changed in nature like the strip of paper; which changed its nature from a two-surfaced structure into a one-surfaced structure. (Run your finger round the second paper model before cutting it and see which is top and which is bottom, or which is 'in' and which is 'out'.)

One essential element in the nature of God is His love, and if His nature is to be expressed through us who worship Him, then above all, we must show this love. So much so-called Christian love is intellectual and so little is practical, so much is 'love-at-a-distance' and not love to our immediate family, servants and neighbours.

Rosemary M. Elliot

# Family – The Patient

— DR. CALVIN COOK

The patient in that corner is obviously a special case. Look at all the diagnosticians around his bed. Why are they all arguing with great heat about the causes of his troubles and the likely consequences? Above all why do they seem unable to decide whether he is fatally sick or reasonably healthy?

The patient in this case is the family, at this moment subject to unparalleled scrutiny by every kind of scientist and authority. What is the family? The word will bring a different picture to each of you. Some picture a husband, wife and children: "God bless the master of this house, likewise the mistress too, and all the little children that round the table grow . . ." a picture with its hint of others besides those round the table: below the salt, below the stairs, yet also part of the household. Others see it more starkly: father, mother, a child in a pram in one of a score of small flats in a large block. Others picture children who share the same mother, but not the same father. For others, it recalls a 1957 Chev. or L.D.V. piled high with relatives on route to a kraal or to a Sunday outing at Zoo Lake. So the first difficulty we face in talking about the family is the question of identity: what is the family? Are we right to think of a single pattern as desirable, even if it could be achieved?

## CHANGES

How sick is the family? Recently, a British anthropologist gave three muted cheers because current European models were breaking down. This he felt let fresh air into stuffy relationships that suffocate youngsters' emotions. Victorians might praise fainting dams, but not the swinging sixties.

The causes of these changes are many and various. Here are some. Young people are again marrying earlier. The wedding often follows rather than precedes the bedding. Divorce stalks one in three of these young couples, and boredom traps many more. Fidelity seems old fashioned because no modern institution seems worthy of it. To be faithful only appears to enable the company, the state, or your own family to take you for granted for their gain and your loss.

The great movement from country to city has affected all our people, but in different ways. The city iso-

lates, and can be very lonely. Old customs and conventions are challenged and lose their force. Young people are thrust into making decisions without guidelines and before they have settled their real goals in life. Earnings are freer than ever from commitments; sex from other personal relationships.

Scientific technology has produced better drugs against venereal disease and better protection against unwanted pregnancies. The shadow of overpopulation newly quantified, questions seriously the ancient axiom of the relationship between marriage and child-bearing. The revolution, started by industrialization and urbanization, has been accelerated by cars, careers and composers.

There is something to be said for and something against each of these changes. Great advances, at a great price. Moreover, when we attempt to draw up a balance sheet, the result only reflects last year's trading, not the present position. By the time we have been able to study the position, it has changed. This kind of darkness disturbs not only the church and welfare organizations that deal with the casualties of change. It disturbs the State as well. State commissions are investigating divorce and homosexuality; family links here are clear. When the State looks into teaching it will find a great deal more about what is happening to the family in our midst. We shall know then where we were.

## A "THREE-RINGED CIRCUS"

The family, in any form, is a three-ringed circus. A circus, moreover, run by those who had little training before they entered the ring. As children, you watched your parental ringmasters from the stalls. But now you are on the sawdust yourself, having to handle the panthers, lions, elephants, performing dogs, pickpockets and fleas.

The first ring is the intimate relationship between husband and wife. Nothing we do before marriage fully prepares us for this continuous inti-

macy in and through which we become known for what we are. Many collapse under the shock, or scramble for somewhere to hide from the unblinking light.

The second ring is the relationship between parent and child. We experience this before marriage, but upside down. Positive parenthood alas does not emerge simply from determination to avoid the mistakes of which you are the sum. The bachelor hardly gets used to his new status as husband, a revolutionary change, when he becomes a father. Human fatherhood is not, as in the animal kingdom, a temporary biological necessity. Father has a responsibility no less important and specific as mother, a responsibility formidable enough to send him for cover behind a bulging briefcase or the paper. Most young mothers have an inbuilt responsibility for their children. But they often confuse their treatment of baby and husband, a mistake husbands often do nothing to hinder.

There is a third ring: the relationship between the home and the community at large. Discrepancies will always exist whether we are trying to keep up with the Joneses, or they with us.

While all this is obvious, like so many obvious things, it is often unnoticed. Our formal institutions of learning generally avoid these emotional minefields and stick to safer paths, for in any class room are many children embarrassed or pained by one or more of these relationships. We may easily forget that two families dominate our cultural experience: the house of Atreus and the house of Abraham. The history of the one is of tragedy, unending, unrelenting and inescapable. The history of the other is one of an impossible blessing promised, the fulfilment of which is always in some sense, to come. The two stories are dissimilar to the point of contradiction, yet we share in both.

Christianity, understood, and misunderstood sets family standards in this country. Yet the model of the Holy Family raises as many questions as it answers. That family began with the scandal of illegitimacy and ended in the scandal of delinquency.

Between, is reconciliation, flight, poverty, bereavement, misunderstanding. The son, as he dies a criminal's death, does not hand his widowed mother to the rest of the family, but entrusts her to his closest friend. The relict of the old family is placed in the care of the beginnings of the new community. No room here for idealization; yet from this friction springs hope for us who know such friction too.

### THREE PRINCIPLES

There seem here to be three principles of continuing importance.

First, marriage and family is voluntary. A full life does not depend on marriage. We have been liberated from the demands of the tribe for a real choice. Those who do not marry are not thereby cut off from emotional or other personal fulfilment. Certainly marriage cannot guarantee such fulfilment automatically. Many marriages in our society still arise because of external pressures on people to marry; these marriages are spurred on by false expectations. To be "left on the shelf" is certainly not a fate worse than death. Marriage may be much worse. The choice of whether to marry or not needs to be related to an ultimate goal. And according to these goals, results will vary.

Second, marriage establishes a new emotional priority. The new relationship between husband and wife takes precedence over all others. Quite right, you agree. But this does not happen unless parents, who are the chief rivals, and therefore the chief obstacles to this happening, have planned such a result from infancy. In-law trouble shows that the deepest emotional currents are still running against accepting this new priority. To switch the deep, powerful and largely unconscious attitudes and emotions that cluster around parent/child relationships to the new and consciously manufactured ones of husband and wife is always tricky. Wives find that they have been married not for themselves, but for the resemblance to mother. If the husband wants to be treated like a son, the relationship may still work, but it is hardly marriage.

Third, marriage is for life. Only when this is accepted are certain objectives attainable. Chief of these is real love, the quality that emerges only as people accompany one another in better and worse, in wealth and poverty, in sickness and health. When we refuse to endure these together, we settle for something less than real love. For this quality of love comes only from intense heat and intense pressure over a long period. But, even more than diamonds, this love is forever. The family is one crucible in which it can be formed.

### GOAL

Two further points. One concerns a possible goal for the family, the other a means of getting there. I do not know how you would judge real community. One good test is whether its members are able to speak the truth to each other in love. To speak the truth we have to be delivered from fear and from the desire to hurt. Malice cannot be truthful. Neither can resentment, jealousy or the other companions of malice. Yet does our love not often attempt to shield those we love from the consequences of truth? Like Niobe, such love tries to shield its children from the arrows of Diana. We seem to have to choose between truth and love. A whole vocabulary underlines the choice: we speak of glamour, cosmetics, charm, white lies — all because we cannot reconcile truth with love.

Is such reconciliation possible? I believe it is. True love, as far as we are concerned springs from being forgiven. Note that: not from presenting and preserving an unblemished record, but from being forgiven. Jesus once said: he who is forgiven little, loves little. His words are of crucial importance for the survival of the family in any worthwhile form. We can only create a record of infallibility for ourselves by using hypocrisy, hardness of heart, deceit and other essentials for a first-class explosion. To be forgiven means being moved towards the truth by the love that forgives us. Such a change enables us to love, for we no longer fear the truth we have met in forgiveness. Here, when all leverage of excuse and

justification has been taken from us, we see what love is and what it costs.

Yet here too, love and truth reinforce each other. Forgiveness speaks the truth in love. Thus what should drive us apart — the recognition of how we have failed to love — forgiveness transforms into a bond of great strength. Where through forgiveness the truth is spoken and heard in love, community grows. Where you see this happening, you know health is returning.

All sick relationships, between husband and wife, between parents and children, between home and community can be thus transformed. The patient in the bed may yet dumbfound all his doctors. For while he may have suffered and still be suffering from every conceivable disease, he is also the place where mankind's doctors have learned what true health is.

*(This is the text of a broadcast given on the English service of the S.A.-B.C. on Friday, June 28th, 1968.)*

### † H. GORIS

Mnr. H. Goris, 'n gewaardeerde medewerker en getroue ondersteuner van ons blad, is op 7 Julie in Pretoria oorlede. Saam met sy eggenote en kinders treur ons oor sy heengaan. Ons verseker hulle van ons innige meegevoel en bid hulle Gods ryke vertroosting toe. Uit sy bydraes aan **Pro Veritate** het ons lesers wyle mnr. Goris leer ken as 'n ernstige Christen wat ons daarin voorgegaan het om diep te buig onder die gesag van Gods Woord. Sy dood is ook vir ons 'n gevoelige verlies.

# Moeder en Dogter

— DS. I. J. THERON

*Onderstaande artikel bevat die inhoud van 'n toespraak wat die skrywer op 17 April 1967 gehou het voor die Mannesendingbond van die Ned. Geref. Gemeente Paarl („Strooidakkerk“) oor die onderwerp: „Hoe kan die Strooidakkerk kontak met die Zionsgemeente behou?“ Die skrywer is tans predikant van die Zionsgemeente, Paarl, van die Ned. Geref. Sendingkerk.*

Die vraag, hoe gemeentes van die Ned. Geref. „Moeder“-kerk en die dogtergemeentes van die Sendingkerk kontak met mekaar kan behou, is vandag vir die hele kerk baie aktueel.

Dit is eintlik ons Afrikaanse kerke, en meer bepaald die Moederkerk wat in die jongste tyd — ons kan sê oor die afgelope dekade — verskeie belangrike uitsprake gedoen en besluite geneem het en daarmee onomwonde bewys het dat hy hieroor bekommerd is en baie ernstig reeds daarvoor besin. Vir my is dit 'n bewys dat die Moederkerk as geheel maar te bewus geword het van die feit dat met die selfstandigwording van die dogterkerk en met die landsbeleid van afsonderlike ontwikkeling en wat dit alles behels, kontak tussen die twee kerke al meer en meer begin uitsterf. Dat daar verwydering en selfs skeiding gekom het tussen die twee kerke, wil niemand seker betwis nie.

## HISTORIESE AGTERGROND

As ons die historiese agtergrond van die kerk so ligweg moet skets, dan vind ons dat in die vroegste jare (d.w.s. kort na die volksplanting aan die Kaap) daar slegs een kerk was. Bekeerlinge uit die gekleurde volke is by die kerk ingeskakel. Eredienste is gesamentlik bygewoon. Die sakramente (Nagmaal en Doop) is gelyktydig gehou. Teen die einde van die 18de eeu, plus minus 150 jaar na die aankoms van Van Riebeeck, is daar eers met afsonderlike bearbeiding begin; dog hierdie mense bly steeds die lidmate van die Moederkerk. Hierdie stap is seker om praktiese redes gedoen. Ek haal hier aan 'n baie insiggewende besluit van die eerste Ringsvergadering van Kaapstad.

„Dat men volgens de leer des Bijbels en den geest des Christendoms verplicht is zoodanige perso-

nen tegelyk met geboren Christenen tot het Avondmaal toe te laten“.

Die Sinode van 1829 staan daarop dat die Nagmaal gelyktydig gevier moet word sonder dat daar tussen lidmate onderskeid gemaak mag word op grond van kleur of afkoms. Agt jaar daarna versoek die Sinode dat daar genoeg sitplekke vir heidene gelaat sal word wat die kerk mag besoek. Hieruit kan sonder enige sweem van twyfel die gevolgtrekking gemaak word dat daar dus in die jaar 1837 nog geen afsonderlike aanbidding was nie. Daar was dus nog geen skeiding nie.

Dit was in die jaar 1855 dat daar in die gemeente Stockenström in die Oostelike Provinsie probleme ontstaan het. Die oorspronklike gemeente het uit Kleurlinge bestaan. 'n Paar blanke lidmate wat hulle by die gemeente gevoeg het, het daarop aangedring — om watter redes weet ek nie — om afsonderlik met die Nagmaal bedien te word. Dit het egter die Kerkraad in 'n geweldige verleentheid geplaas omdat so 'n versoek vir hulle eenvoudig in stryd was met die Nagmaalsformulier, die geloofsartikels en sekere Skrifgedeeltes. Die saak het voor die Ring van Albanie gediens en die aanbeveling is gemaak dat die Kleurlinge eers afsonderlik bedien sal word en daarna die blankes. Voorwaar 'n baie ingrypende besluit, want dit raak 'n gebruik wat oor 'n tydperk van ongeveer 200 jaar in swang was. Honderd en tien jaar gelede, in die jaar 1857, neem die Sinode die volgende besluit:

„De Synode beschouwt het wenschelijk Schriftmatig, dat onze ledematen uit de heidenen, in onze bestaande gemeenten opgenomen en ingelijfd worden, overal waar zulks geschieden kan, maar waar deze maatregel, ten gevolge van de zwakheid van sommigen, de bevordering van de zaak van Chris-

tus onder de heidenen, in den weg zouden staan, de gemeente uit de heidenen opgericht, of nog op te richten, hare Christelijke voorrechten in een afzonderlijke gebouw of gesticht genieten zal“.

Wat bewys dit nou vir ons? Seker net dit, dat die Sinode die standpunt inneem dat daar geen Skriftuurlike gronde vir skeiding is nie maar wel praktiese gronde.

In die jaar 1803 het die kerkraad van die Paarl soos volg besluit:

„Een eigen Oefenmeester in de Contry aan te stellen om de slaven te onderwysen“.

As oefenmeester het hom aangebied die heer Daniel le Roux „mits alle beletselen mochten weggenomen“. In 1819 het oefenmeester Le Roux „aan de gouverneur een request gezonden om een stuk land, ten einde er zoodanig gebou op te stichten om de slaven en de heidenen in de Christelijke religie te onderwysen“. Hier het ons dus weer 'n stap weg van die kerk af. Daarop het Lord Charles Somerset magistraat Van Ryneveld gestuur om die grond te gaan besigtig en op laasgenoemde se aanbeveling is dit „frank en vrij geskonken“. Die kerkgebou is opgerig, en op 18 September 1820 is die inwydingsrede deur ds. Gebhard van die Paarl gehou. Dit is die kerkgebou te Wagenmakersvallei (Wellington) wat onlangs tot historiese monument verklaar is.

Hierdie stap van die Paarlse moedergemeente (Strooidak) het dan ook gelei tot die stigting van die N.G. Sendingkerk te Wellington in 1881. Ek kom later weer hierby terug.

Ek roep hier net baie kortliks in herinnering hoe die sendingwerk in die Paarl self begin het. Die Franse vlugteling het eintlik die eerste sendingwerk hier onder die slawe begin. In 1820 het reeds 'n plaaslike sendinggenootskap bestaan onder die naam „De Paarlse Medewerkend

Zendinggenootskap". In hierdie jaar het die Londense Sendinggenootskap die werk oorgeneem, 'n gemeente gestig en die eerste slawe gedoop. In 1898 het die grootste gedeelte van die gemeente besluit om by die jong N.G. Sendingkerk aan te sluit. Vandag is dit bekend as die Zionsgemeente. Die ander deel het by C.U.S.A. aangesluit.

Die **Immanuelgemeente** het so ontstaan: Toe Paarl nog maar een gemeente was (Strooidak), is in die noordelike deel van die dorp 'n kerkgeboutjie opgerig met die naam van „Het Gesticht". Hier het blanke en Kleurling-lidmate van die Strooidakgemeente saam aanbid. Verskeie leraars het die gemeente bedien, t.w. eerww. J. W. van der Bos, D. S. Botha, G. J. Willemse, D. J. de Villiers. Eers in 1908 is eerw. D. C. Theron as leraar beroep om meer bepaald onder die Kleurlinge te werk. Dit was nog 'n stap weg van die Moederkerk af. In die doop-, lidmaat- en huweliksregister van die Strooidakkerk sal u name vind soos Kearns, Fortuin, Cornelissen, Carolissen, Cupido, Martin, ens., ens. — almal Kleurlinge.

### STIGTING VAN DIE N.G. SENDINGKERK

Om terug te kom by die stigting van die N.G. Sendingkerk. Vanaf hierdie datum (1881) het, wat my betref, kontak tussen blanke en Kleurling Christene moeiliker begin word en het hul weë al verder van mekaar begin loop. Dit is 'n voldonge feit dat geestelike gemeenskap met mekaar iets van die vervloë verlede is. Ons leef by mekaar verby. Ons weet weinig, of in die meeste gevalle niks, van mekaar. Die belangstelling in mekaar is nie daar nie. Daardie warme wedersydse liefde wat tog immers die verhouding tussen die „moeder" en die „dogter" behoort te kenmerk, is net nie daar nie. In werklikheid is dit 'n soort stiefmoeder-stiefdogter-verhouding.

### KONTAK: OP WATTER VLAK?

Ek voel verheug oor die feit dat die Strooidakkerk kontak wil behou. Die woordjie „behou" sê vir my dat daar nog 'n mate van kontak veronderstel word. Maar die vraag is: Kontak op watter vlak? Tussen die leraars? In 'n mate, ja. En as dit oor hierdie kontak gaan, is daar, wat my betref,

geen probleem dat dit behou kan word nie. Dit is egter net baie beperk. Gaan dit oor die waarneem van preekbeurte deur die leraars van die Moederkerk in die dogterkerk? Nou onlangs nog het daar van ons kant so 'n versoek uitgegaan. Is dit miskien die kontak deur die finansiële steun wat Zionskerk tot September verlede jaar ontvang het? Wel, dit was die Moederkerk self wat hierdie band gebreek het. Volgens my beskeie mening het die Moederkerk hier beslis 'n groot fout begaan. Nie dat ons nie daarsonder kan klaarkom nie, maar uit 'n brief wat Zionskerkraad van Strooidakkerk ontvang het, kon afgelei word dat die Moederkerk moontlik vir die **man** bygedra het en nie vir die **saak** nie. Ons baseer ons gevolgtrekking daarop dat dit reeds in ander gemeentes gebeur het. Aan die goeie gesindheid van die Zionskerk teenoor die Strooidakgemeente sal dit wel niks verander nie, maar niemand sal ons dit kwalik neem as ons met groter intensiteit die gemeente tot groter finansiële selfstandigheid probeer lei nie. Aan die Here al die dank en eer dat ons in die afgelopen paar maande so ver op hierdie pad gevorder het dat ons, as ons die huidige tempo van ons inkomste kan handhaaf, aan die einde van die jaar ons skuld uitgewis sal sien en ook in staat sal wees om 'n medeleraar te beroep sonder enige finansiële hulp van buite. Hierdie band is, soos ek dit sien, vir eers gebreek en straks vir goed gebreek. Die Moederkerk het hom gebreek, en nie ons nie.

Ek vra weer: Watter kontak tussen die „moeder" en die „dogter" is dit wat behou moet word? Of gaan dit oor nuwe kontakte wat gemaak moet word? Hoe dit ook sy, die Sendingkerk en m.n. Zionskerk se deure staan oop, wawyd oop vir die Moederkerk. Die Sendingkerk se hand het hy nog nie teruggetrek nie, al het die moeder dit in baie opsigte reeds gelos. Die Kleurling is in die war. Hy weet nie waar hy aan en waar hy af is nie. Dit deur omstandighede wat grotendeels deur die moeder geskep is.

By die lidmaat van die Sendingkerk is daar bv. nie die kleurvooroordeel wat daar by so baie blanke Christene is nie. Dit is die Moederkerk wat die hand weer moet vat. Die Sendingkerk kan nie die inisiatief neem nie. Dit kan verkeerd vertolk word, miskien as voorbarigheid.

Dit moet onthou word dat die Sendingkerk al 'n taamlieke groot

dogter is. Zionskerk is 'n tipiese voorbeeld hiervan. Die dogter is al byna mondig. Sy het al sowat 50 van haar eie seuns opgelewer vir die bediening. Op kulturele, sosiale en ekonomiese gebied het baie van haar kinders al reeds ver gevorder. Sy het ook talle toegewyde en opregte Christene. In Zionsgemeente het ons 'n kerkraad waarvan sommige van die lede intellektueel ver ontwikkel is (vyf is onderwysers) en baie aktief ingeskakel is in die werksaamhede van die gemeente. Baie van ons lidmate het 'n diepe insig in geestelike sake en 'n voorliefde vir die Woord van God. Wat Zionskerk betref, is ek daarvan oortuig dat niks in die weg gelê sal word na nouere kontak met mekaar nie. Ons is nie antagonisies teenoor die lede van die Moederkerk nie.

### GEESTELIKE GEMEENSAP

Die Sendingkerk bevraagteken egter die soort kontak wat daar tot nogtoe tussen die twee kerke was, nl. kontak slegs tussen die leraars wedersyds, kontak waar daar finansiële hulp aan die Sendingkerk verleen word of waar daar van die kant van die Moederkerk met basars gehelp word. **Die Sendingkerk voel dat waar dit om die wese van die kerk gaan, die allerbelangrikste, nl. geestelike gemeenskap, buite rekening gelaat word.** En waar dit wel beoefen word, is dit nog net altyd die moeder wat na die dogter kom maar nooit die dogter na die moeder nie. Daar word reeds vandag grappenderwys in die Sendingkerk gesê: „Ons het darem 'n baie snaakse moeder wat na die dogter toe kom, maar die dogter mag nie na die moeder toe gaan nie!" Onlangs het ek 'n gemeentesuster die opmerking hoor maak: „Die Vroue Sendingbond hou met ons konferensie in ons kerk, maar nooit gaan ons na hulle nie".

Met die bevestiging van leraars in die Sendingkerk sal die Moederkerk altyd en oral deur die dogter geken word. Maar ek weet nie van een geval waar die Moederkerk al ooit 'n Kleurlingleraar na so 'n plegtigheid uitgenooi het nie. Dit is tog goeie gebruik dat as ek genooi word, ek ook weer sal uitnoui.

### GEEN VRYMOEDIGHEID

Mag ek dit beklemtoon dat die dogter nie vrymoedigheid het tot toenadering nie? Hierdie stelling van



my kan ek staaf met etlike voorbeelde.

● (i) 'n Blanke sendeling word bevestig in 'n sendinggemeente. Die konsulent is 'n Kleurlingeraar. By eersgenoemde se ontvangs in die Moedergemeente, soos die gebruik is, word die voorsitter van die Ring, wat 'n blanke is, genooi; maar nie die konsulent nie. Na die onthaal in die Sendingkerk, wat gewoonlik die volgende dag gehou word, word nie slegs die predikant van die Moederkerk uitgenooi nie maar ook die hele gemeente.

● (ii) In 1965 kom 'n sekere sendeling in 'n motorongeluk om. Die begrafnisdiens word in die Moederkerk van die betrokke dorp gehou. Twee van dieselfde Ring se leraars is Kleurlinge. Hulle, tesame met 'n Kleurlingeraar uit 'n ander Ring (wat uit belangstelling na die begrafnis gegaan het) en die Sendinggemeente van die afgestorwe leraar, is verbied om selfs op die kerkgronde te kom. Dit is aan my vertel dat 'n polisie-konstabel hierdie leraars en gemeentelede van die kerk se hek af na die ander kant van die straat gedrywe het ten aanskoue van ander blanke sendelinge.

● (iii) Dit het ook in 1965 plaasgevind. Ek telefoneer 'n sekere dominee van 'n moedergemeente in die Paarl om 'n afspraak met hom te maak. Hy was egter nie tuis nie en sy vrou beantwoord die telefoon. Ek deel haar toe mee wie ek is en dat ek graag haar man wou spreek. „Kom maar so elfuur se kant, dan sal hy tuis wees”, antwoord sy. Drie minute voor elf lui ek die deurklokkie. Die bediende maak die deur oop en op dieselfde tydstip maak Mevrouw ook haar verskyning. „Dit is seker jy wat netnou gebel het”, val sy toe weg.

„Ja, Mevrouw”, sê ek.

„Nou ja, gaan wag maar solank daar in die straat. My man is nog nie tuis nie.”

● (iv) 'n Seun van die Sendingkerk wat predikant is in een van ons gemeentes tree verlede jaar in die huwelik. Hy vra 'n leraar van die Moederkerk om die huwelik te bevestig en dan somer ook die heildronk in te stel. 'n Blanke paar uit die moedergemeente wou ook graag die huwelik bywoon. Met baie moeite moes daar vir vier mense eers 'n permit verkry word.

### EEN KERK

Die dogter word groot. Binne afsienbare tyd sal sy nie meer die

moeder as moeder sien nie, maar wel as suster. Net soos Liza Doolittle in Shaw se *Pygmalion* die ontdekking gemaak het dat daar nie meer enige verskil tussen haar en leermeester prof. Higgins op sosiale gebied bestaan nie en die skoen na sy kop geslinger het, so begin die Ned. Geref. Sendingkerk stadigaan besef dat hy die Moederkerk binnekort op gelyke vlak sal ontmoet. Daar is in werklikheid geen verskil tussen die Moederkerk en die Sendingkerk nie. Ons gebruik dieselfde Bybel en dieselfde voertaal, ons staan op dieselfde belydenisgrondslag en ons gebruik dieselfde liturgiese formuliere. In hoofsaak is ons kerkdienste volgens dieselfde patroon ingerig. Daar is meer as genoeg dinge wat ons met mekaar gemeen het om nadere kontak prakties uitvoerbaar te maak. Al sal ons twee kerkrade eers net saam kom om saam te bid, het ons al ver gevorder.

### KERKLIKE BESLUITE

Dat die Christelike kerke toenadering tot mekaar soek, is 'n voldonge feit. Daar is 'n **ekumeniese beweging** dwarsdeur die wêreld. In 1956 het die **Raad van die Ned. Geref. Kerke** in 'n beleidsverklaring wat hy uitgereik het, o.m. die volgende gesê: Waar die historiese ontwikkeling op sendinggebied deur die eeue onder die druk van omstandighede tendense van on-Christelike eksklusiwisme vertoon en só die beoefening van ware Christelike gemeenskap tussen Christene van verskillende rasse belemmer het, het dit geskied nóg deur kwaadwillige gesindheid teenoor nie-blankes, nóg met die goedkeuring van die amptelike leiding van die Kerk, maar moet dit gesien word as die resultaat van onbeheerbare omstandighede en van algemene menslike swakheid.

Ons kan sê dat die Raad by implikasie vir **geestelike gemeenskap** pleit terwyl hy ruitelik erken dat dit skadelik gelyk het.

Die **Gereformeerde Ekumeniese Sinode**, Potchefstroom 1958, het soos volg besluit: Nouer samewerking op die terrein van kerklike vergaderings en besprekings moet gesoek word, en die kerk moet deur sy lering en voorbeeld sy lede opvoed en voorberei vir die beoefening van Christelike gemeenskap met gelowiges uit ander rasse.

In 1960 het die **Uniale Sendingkongres**, gehou te Kroonstad, die vol-

gende besluit geneem: „Die Kongres neem met dankbaarheid kennis van die geleentheid wat daar telkens kom vir samesprekings tussen moeder- en dogterkerke en versoek die verantwoordelike kerkbesture om meer sulke geleentheid te skep. Sulke geleentheid kan gevind word in gesamentlike konferensies, biddae en byeenkomste vir onderlinge versterking en spesiale geleentheid wat in 'n plaaslike gemeente mag voorkom”.

In dieselfde jaar word op die **Kerkeberaad te Cottesloe** besluit: Niemand wat in Jesus Christus glo, mag uitgesluit word uit enige kerk op grond van sy kleur of ras nie. Die geestelike eenheid van alle mense wat in Christus is, moet sigbaar tot uiting kom in handeling van gemeenskaplike aanbidding en getuienis, in gemeenskap en konsultasie oor sake van gemeenskaplike belang.

Ons weet natuurlik dat die Ned. Geref. Kerk hom nie wou vereenselwig met die besluite van Cottesloe nie, maar slegs 'n jaar later, in 1961, neem die **Kaapse Sinode** die volgende besluit: „Die Sinode wil dan ook alle gemeentes van ons kerk aanmoedig om, met die nodige versigtigheid en Christelike liefde, weë te soek waarlangs ons as Christene en lidmate met dieselfde belydenis mekaar beter kan leer ken en beter kan leer saamwerk en kan leer saambid in belang van Gods koninkryk”.

### ONRUSTIG

Dat die kerk, en m.n. die Ned. Geref. Moederkerk onrustig is oor die geleidelike skeiding wat daar tussen „Moederkerk” en „Dogterkerk” aan die kom is, ly geen twyfel nie. Die kerk moet daarvoor onrustig wees as hy hom die naam van kerk waardig ag. Hy kan nie anders nie, want hierdie skeiding werk die verbokkeling van die liggaam van Christus in die hand. Is hierdie skeiding dan nie in stryd met ons kerk se belydenis nie, wat lui: Ons glo in die gemeenskap van die heiliges? Is dit nie ook in stryd met die Nagmaalsformulier nie? „Want soos uit baie graankorrels een meel gemaal en een brood gebak word, en uit baie druiwekorrels, as hulle gepars word, een wyn en drank vloei, en tot een vermeng word, net so sal ons almal wat deur die waaragtige geloof in Christus ingelyf is, deur broederlike liefde om Christus ons lieve Saligmaker ontwil, wat ons tevore so uitnemend liefgehad het, almal saam een

liggaam wees, en dit nie alleen met woorde nie, maar ook met die daad teenoor mekaar bewys".

As daardie gemeenskap dan net eendag in die hiernamaals moet plaasvind, wat dan van ons lewe op hierdie aarde? Kan ons 'n woord wat so duidelik op ons lewe hier betrekking het, werklik met soveel gemak in die hiernamaals wegpraat? Ons mag die beoefening van wedersydse geestelike kontak sekerlik nie op so 'n manier as 'n „eskatologiese leerstuk" benader nie.

Daar word gepraat van 'n Blanke volk, 'n Indiërvolk, 'n Kleurlingvolk en 'n Bantoevolk. Maar wie is dan die Christenvolk? Is dit dan 'n verdeelde volk volgens die patroon van afsonderlike etniese groepe?

### VERTOONVENSTER VIR BUITEWÊRELD?

Die N.G. Sendingkerk is geen eksperiment nie. Hy is ook nie bedoel om soos Liza Doolittle 'n weddenskap mee te wen nie. Hy is ook geen vertoonvenster om vir die buitewêreld te wys wat vir die inheemse volke op kerklike gebied gedoen word nie. Die N.G. Sendingkerk is 'n deel, 'n baie belangrike deel van die gemeente van Jesus Christus wat Hy met sy bloed vrygekoop het.

Wat sê die Heilige Skrif, wat tog enigsins die norm is (of behoort te wees) van ons Christelike handelinge, hieromtrent? In I Pet. 2:9 lees ons: „Julle is 'n uitverkore geslag, 'n

koninklike priesterdom, 'n heilige volk, 'n volk as eiendom verkry, om te verkondig die deugde van Hom wat julle uit die duisternis geroep het tot sy wonderbare lig". Alle Christene behoort tot die familie van Christus, so verneem ons in Matt. 12:50: „Elkeen wat die wil doen van my Vader wat in die hemele is, dié is my broer en suster en moeder". In Jesus se Hoëpriesterlike gebed in Joh. 17, is dit veral die woorde van vers 21 wat ons daaraan herinner: „Dat almal een mag wees net soos U, Vader, in My en Ek in U; dat hulle ook in Ons een mag wees, sodat die wêreld kan glo dat U My gestuur het".

### „BRÛE"

Daar word heeldag gepleit dat daar brûe gebou moet word tussen die verskillende bevolkingsgroepe. Wanneer bou jy dan 'n brug? Dan nie wanneer jy 'n skeiding wat daar is, wil oorbrug nie? En het ons nie brûe nodig vir die skeidings wat ons self gemaak het nie? Deur wetgewing word ons geografies, sosiaal en geestelik van mekaar geskei. Die Kleurling-gelowiges wil veral geestelik met die blankes verkeer. En omdat hierdie verkeer nie daar is nie, raak ons vervreemd van mekaar.

Nie uit pessimisme nie maar op grond van my waarneming van die feite wil ek beweer dat daar duidelike tekens is dat Moederkerk en Dogterkerk besig is om verder en verder van

mekaar af weg te drywe. Die Sendingkerk sal daardeur nader aan ander Christelike kerke beweeg, soos die Congregational-, Morawiese-, Metodiste-kerk en ander erkende kerke en kerkgenootskappe. Daar bestaan nou al reeds 'n noue samewerking tussen die Sendingkerk en hierdie kerke in baie dele van ons land. Dit is om baie redes net onvermydelik. Geografies leef ons in dieselfde gebiede, daar kom sake van gemeenskaplike belang, daar vind oor en weer trouery plaas, daar is sosiale omgang, ens.

### BID EN DOEN

Ek het onlangs met iemand oor hierdie aangeleentheid gepraat en sy mening was dat ons maar moet bid dat die Here die struikelblokke uit die weg mag ruim. Ek was dit egter nie met hom eens nie. By die opwekking van Lasarus het Jesus gesê: Neem (julle!) die steen weg. Daar is dinge wat die mens self moet doen. Christus sal sy deel doen, maar dit sal nie help om te bid as ons nie doen wat Hy vir ons sê om te doen nie.

Hoe kan ons kontak maak en behou? En hoe kan ons dit selfs uitbou? So kan dinge nie bly nie. Laat ons ons cers vergewis van die aard van die kontak wat ons wil hê en dan besluit of dit in belang van Gods koninkryk is. Daar sál offers geverg word. Is ons bereid om daardie offers te bring?

## Letters — Briewe

### ECUMENISM AND TRUTH

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

I find it difficult to follow the argument put forward by Dr. W. B. de Villiers as explained in the summary of his article "Ekumene -- Op Voorwaarde" (June issue).

Surely there are certain truths, divinely revealed, which were committed to the Church at the beginning. The question therefore is: are

these divinely revealed truths known and taught today, or have they been lost sight of? If they are known today, then clearly they must be proclaimed and taught today, and this must be done even at the high cost of religious division, for it is hard to imagine that any Christian would want to suppress or compromise divinely revealed truth simply in order to attain an outward show of religious unity. On the other hand, if the truths committed to the Church at the beginning are not known today, then it would seem that another Revelation from God is necessary today in order to make them known! Study of Scripture, howsoever sincere, would not be sufficient to make them known because the

written word can so easily be differently interpreted, and we know from experience, and to our cost, that it is in fact interpreted in many different ways. The written word is dead until it has a living interpreter to bring it to life, and did not Christ give us that living interpreter when He founded His Church and commissioned it, with His full authority, to teach all nations? It seems to me, therefore, that the task and purpose of the ecumenical movement is primarily to lead us all to agreement as to the nature, function and essential teaching of the Church.

## FAITH AND TRADITION

Mr. Stephen Hayes, St. Chad's College, North Bailey, Durham City, U.K.

The comments of Mr. V. G. Davies on my article 'Faith and Superstition' call for further elucidation. Mr. Davies says he does not understand my statement that our faith was not given by Jesus to the apostles, and by the apostles to the bishops and clergy, and then handed down from generation to generation until it reached us. I would agree with Mr. Davies that living faith is not something we are born with, that it is not something which emanates from within the individual. I think that the reason for his misunderstanding is that he identifies faith with tradition. I think that tradition has a very important place in the Christian Church, but that it is not the same as faith, and that a distinction has to be made between the two.

Tradition is, by definition, what has been handed on from one person to another. The Christian tradition

is the Gospel, the good news about Jesus Christ. It is this proclamation of what God has done for the world in Jesus Christ that constitutes the Christian tradition. It is this that has been handed down through time, from the apostles to the bishops and from generation to generation until it reached us. The Bible is a part of this tradition, because this is how the Bible came to us. The tradition is handed on in space as well as in time, as Christians have spread throughout the world.

The Gospel which we have received is our tradition because we have received it, and this is the Gospel which we preach. But faith is not the Gospel, it is not the preaching of the Gospel, nor is it the handing on of the tradition. *Faith is our response to the preaching of the Gospel.* This response is not automatic, and it cannot be handed on or given to anyone else. At the same time, it is not something we can cook up for ourselves — it is a gift of the Holy Spirit — "for by grace ye have been saved through faith; and that

not of yourselves: it is the gift of God: not of works, that no man should glory." (Ephesians 2:8).

Faith is the act of believing. The Gospel is what is believed by the faithful. The superstition of which I wrote in my article can arise when the Gospel is no longer received with faith. When we look back on the Church in past ages, and we see that for people then Christianity was a living and exciting thing, it was real to them, and something they were enthusiastic about. We might know some of the things they did, and we think that if we do the same things, we will be able to catch something of their faith. And so we copy what was done in the past, without knowing *why* these things were done by the people who first did them — and it is this that can become superstition. I believe it was St. Augustine who said that it is futile to believe the doctrine of the Trinity if one does not love the Trinity itself — and that seems to convey the sort of distinction I was trying to make.

# Church Unity

It is natural that many inside and outside the churches wonder whether we, in the ecumenical movement, do not attach exaggerated importance to the question of church-unity. Some have no interest in that question because they consider that the differences between the churches are disappearing anyway. They find Christians in other churches with whom they feel closer kinship than with many in their own church. Others feel that church-unity might aggravate the institutionalist tendencies in church life and create even less flexible structures than we have today. I believe that we must hold on to the original conviction of the ecumenical movement, that it belongs to the very nature of the people of God to live as one reconciled and therefore united family and that it belongs to its witness to present to the world the image of a new humanity which knows no walls of separation within its own life. Even the best co-operation and the most intensive dialogue are no substitutes for full fellowship in Christ.

But I wonder at the same time whether it is not largely our own fault that so many conceive of unity in terms of uniformity and centralisation and are therefore afraid of it.

Should we not have learned after these decades of common life in the ecumenical movement that the Holy Spirit has used very many different forms of church-order for His work of inspiration, conversion and prophesy? And have we given sufficient attention to the indisputable fact that the earliest Church knew several quite distinct types of church order?

My point is simply that there seems to be no really urgent reason to identify unity with acceptance of one and the same church order. Do we not discover in our increasingly pluralistic cultural situation that what is good for one continent or region is not necessarily good for another?

And must we not draw the conclusion that there can be real fellowship in faith and in sacrament even when structures differ?

In any case it remains a central part of the mandate of the ecumenical movement to maintain, as New Delhi put it, that unity is both God's Will and His gift to the Church; that it must be made visible in each place and that the faithful in each place must be united with the whole Christian fellowship in all places and all ages. I hope that Uppsala will not merely confirm this insight, but develop its implications so clearly that all churches may be encouraged to make a much greater effort for the promotion of true unity.

(Extract from an address "The Mandate of the Ecumenical Movement" by Dr. W. A. Visser 't Hooft, at the Fourth Assembly of the World Council of Churches, Uppsala, July, 1968. The full text of his address will appear in our next issue).

## „ONS HET IETS ANDERS VERWAG”

In *Gereformeerde Weekblad* (17 Mei 1968) skryf prof. dr. G. Th. Rothuizen oor die proteste wat op die onlangs gehou sinodes van die Ned. Geref. Kerk van Noord- en Suid-Transvaal opgegaan het teen dans, teen die feit dat die kleredrag van vroue by die dans seksueel stimulerend is, teen die wyse waarop Kersfees in Suid-Afrika gevier word en teen die inhoud van sekere boeke (met die versoek aan die regering om strenger sensuur toe te pas), en sê dat dit vir hom begryplik is.

Teen die dra van 'n minirok het hy ook beswaar, verseker prof. Rothuizen. Nie soseer omdat hy dit sedeloos vind nie, maar omdat dit smakeloos is. Dit is egter moontlik dat dit in Suid-Afrika meer seksueel stimulerend werk as smaakbederwend, maar „dan plaas ek 'n vraagteken nie alleen, en selfs nie in die eerste plek, agter die draers nie, maar agter die kykers. In Suid-Afrika is die manne blykbaar snel op temperatuur”.

Ook vind hy dit begryplik as daar getoorn word teen onsedelike vorme van dans. „Maar 'n mens moet dan duidelik wees en sê wat onsedelik is as daar gedans word. Die eerste moet onder sensuur — die laaste nie. 'n Mens kan moeilik alle vorme van dans gaan verbied. Daarvoor is baie danse eenvoudig te speels en te plesierig”.

Die viering van Kersfees is ook in Nederland 'n „barre

saak”. Maar as in gedagte gehou word 90% van blanke Suid-Afrika kerklik-ingeskrewe is, „is het aldaar wel heel bar”.

„Slechte boeke” heeft men daar blykbaar ook al. Zelfs zó veel, dat men er minstens drie per dag moet verbieden en dat is nog te weinig”. Dit sou miskien darem wel te ver gaan as boeke waarin daar gedans word, ook al is dit in minirokke, verbied sou word.

Dit is begryplik, sê prof. Rothuizen, al ag hy dit nie in dieselfde mate verstandig nie.

Maar in die hele saak is daar iets wat onbegryplik is.

„Ons het immers iets anders verwag toe die grootste kerk in Suid-Afrika begin protesteer het. Ons het 'n besluit verwag op 'n punt waaroor die hele (ook Protestantse, ook Gereformeerde) wêreld in gretige afwagting verkeer. Op 'n punt waar, nota bene, Suid-Afrika self van 'n reusagtige probleem praat. Ek bedoel natuurlik die apartheidsp probleem. Persoonlik vind ek dit geen probleem nie, in die sin dat ek die apartheidspolitiek onchristelik ag. Nie omdat die blankes in Suid-Afrika nie genoeg vir die swartes sou doen nie. Hulle doen daar waarlik nie min nie. Die Vorster-regering selfs meer as ooit. En die N.G. Kerk staan daarby nie agter nie. Hierdie kerk gee bv. miljoene en miljoene vir die sending. Maar omdat, omgekeerd, swart daar so weinig vir blank mag doen, daartoe eenvoudig nie in staat geag word nie. Dit vind ek

in flagrante stryd met die mees elementêre opvattinge van liefde tot die naaste. Om jou naaste lief te hê, beteken nie slegs om jouself nodig te maak vir jou naaste nie, maar ook om vir jou naaste duidelik te maak dat jy hóm nodig het vir jouself (Matter). Om vir iemand iets te mag doen, is selfs nog meer as om saam met iemand iets te mag doen. Maar daarvoor nie nou nie. Wat vanuit Suid-Afrika altyd teenoor ons buitestaanders gesê word, is dat ons veels te maklik en probleemloos praat oor iets wat volgens die mense daar 'n reusagtige probleem is. Nouja — nogmaals — wanneer hulle tog as kerk die swye gaan verbreek en resolusies gaan opstel, dan moes ons op dáárdie gebied iets kon verwag het. Veral vanuit 'n kerk wat in Suid-Afrika 'n politieke invloed het wat nie onderskat moet word nie, omdat die meeste lede van die regeringsparty, die Nasionale Party, wat die apartheidspolitiek ingevoer het en verdedig, lidmate is van hierdie kerk. Dit klink nie erg mooi nie. Ek kan dit mooier sê. Anders as die Nederduits Hervormde Kerk het die Nederduitse Gereformeerde Kerk apartheid nie in sy kerkorde opgeneem nie. Ook was dit hierdie kerk wat hom in 1964 tot die owerheid gewend het in verontrusting oor die arbeidsomstandighede van die Bantoes. Laat ek dit dan nou só stel: Juis daarom moes 'n mens nou iets meer en iets anders kon verwag. Maar niks daarvan nie”.