



PRO VERITATE

ALBERT GEYSER

Calvyn was nie 'n Nasionalis nie

MARK COLLIER

'Endorsement out' of religious workers to their homelands

IAN THOMPSON

Impressions of the W.C.C. consultation on racism

L. MABASO

A radio generation

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

Volume VIII No. 2 | Jaargang VIII Nr. 2

JUNE 15 JUNIE 1969

PRO VERITATE

CHRISTELIKE MAANDBLAD VIR SUIDELIKE AFRIKA
CHRISTIAN MONTHLY FOR SOUTHERN AFRICA

REDAKSIE

REDAKTEUR:

Dr. B. Engelbrecht.

REDAKSIONELE KOMITEE:

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

ADMINISTRASIE/ KORRESPONDENSIE

SIRKULASIEBESTUURDER:

Dr. W. B. de Villiers.

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

INTEKENGELD

Intekengeld is vooruit-betaalbaar.

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

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

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

LET WEL

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

PRO VERITATE verskyn elke 15de van die maand.

(Prys per enkel-eksemplaar 10c)

IN HIERDIE UITGAWE...

- Prof. Albert Geyser betwis die aanspraak van „Calvinistiese” Nasionaliste dat hulle hul op Calvyn kan beroep vir hulle nasionalistiese eksklusiwisme. Bl. 4
- Br. Mark Collier bespreek die "uit-endossering" van evangeliedienaars uit die buiteland. Bl. 6
- Prof. B. B. Keet skryf oor die jaarverslag van die Wêreldbond van Gereformeerde Kerke; oor 'n landelike kerk wat 'n stedelike kerk geword het; en oor diskussies in gereformeerde kringe oor vrysinnigheid. Bl. 12
- Mnr. Ian Thompson, lektor in die Filosofie aan die Universiteit van die Witwatersrand, gee 'n kort verslag van sy indrukke van die Wêreldraad van Kerke se konsultasie oor rassisme wat onlangs in Londen gehou is. Bl. 14
- Mnr. L. Mabaso, redakteur van Isithunywa, Durban, bespreek die voor- en nadele van massa-kommunikasie-middele, met spesifieke verwysing na die Bantoe. Bl. 16

IN THIS ISSUE...

- Prof. Albert Geyser refutes the claim of "Calvinistic" Nationalists that Calvin would support their nationalistic exclusivism. P. 4
- Br. Mark Collier discusses the "endorsement out" of ministers of religion from abroad. P. 6
- Prof. B. B. Keet writes about the annual report of the World Alliance of Reformed Churches; about a rural Church which became an urban church; and about discussions in Reformed church circles on liberalism. P. 12
- Mr. Ian Thompson, lecturer of Philosophy at the University of the Witwatersrand, gives a brief report of his impressions of the W.C.C.'s consultation on racism which was recently held in London. P. 14
- Mr. L. Mabaso, Editor of Isithunywa, Durban, discusses the advantages and disadvantages of mass communication media, with specific reference to Africans. P. 16

Jeug-Opstandigheid

Dr. W. B. DE VILLIERS

Al hoe meer nuus bereik ons omtrent opflikkerings van die skynbaar universele opstandigheid van die moderne jeug. Oorsese universiteite word gekwel deur 'n stygende vloed studente-opstande en 'n magtige land soos Frankryk is verlede jaar bykans lamgelê deur onluste wat hul oorsprong onder die studerende jeug gehad het. Blykens berigte uit die V.S.A. wil dit voorkom of selfs pres. Nixon hom nou begin bemoei met die universiteitsonluste wat op so 'n skaal begin voorkom dat dit reeds een van die mees brandende landsvraagstukke geword het.

Ook ons hier in Suid-Afrika gaan, om te oordeel na onlangse en toenemende berigte, dié probleem blykbaar nie gespaar bly nie. Of die verskynsel nou van oorsee af hierheen oorgewaaai het en of dit die produk is van 'n soort spontane geestelike ontbranding onder ons eie jong mense, is eintlik nie so seer ter sake nie. Wat wel van noemenswaardige betekenis is, is dat die verskynsel hom ongetwyfeld reeds deeglik hier te lande ingewortel het en dat dit besig is om ontstellend vinnig te groei in omvang. Die tyd is skynbaar vir goed verby dat ons die opstandigheid onder ons eie jeug met 'n minagtende skouerophaling kan afmaak of dat ons opsetlik anderpad kan kyk in die hoop dat dit vanself sal kwyn en verdwyn.

Met onstellende reëlmatigheid volg die berigte nou op mekaar wat almal dui op 'n groeiende onrus veral onder ons studerende jeug: 'n plakkaatbetoging hier, 'n straatoptog daar; 'n studente-a'vaardiging wat by 'n staatsminister gaan protesteer; iewers 'n eksperimentele erediens met ongewone psigedeliese newe-effekte.

En dan is daar natuurlik ook die onmiskenbare siekteverskynsels waarmee die hele opstandigheid onvermydelik gepaard gaan in sommige kringe: die toenemende seksuele losbandigheid onder ons jongmense, die groeiende verslaafdheid aan prikkel- en dwelmiddels, die aanwas van die homoseksualiteit en lesbianisme, die opsetlike „uitsakkers" uit die samelewing, die ontstellende getal jeugselfmoorde en jeugmisdade.

Natuurlik is alles i.v.m. hierdie hedendaagse opstand onder die jeug nie vanself en noodwendig onstellend nie. Inteendeel: dit sou voorwaar onstellend wees as ons moderne Suid-Afrikaanse jeug hoegenaamd **nie** opstandig was onder heersende omstandighede nie. Die jare van ons jonkheid is immers normaalweg die periode van **Sturm und Drang** en hartstogtelike verset teen die bestaande orde was nog deur al die eeue heen die kenmerkendste karaktertrek van 'n gesonde rypwordingsproses by die mens. In 'n sekere sin dus kan ons die heersende opstandigheid by die jeug slegs maar verwelkom, veral in 'n land en onder 'n gemeenskap waar blinde tradisieverering, slaafse konformisme en vraaglose gesagsaanvaarding ongetwyfeld reeds byna patologiese afmetings begin aanneem het.

Nogtans verteenwoordig die skynbaar opsetlike uitspattigheid, die klaarblyklike moedswilligheid en die noulks verbloemde uittartendheid wat die hedendaagse opstandigheid so dikwels kenmerk,

'n **novum** wat aanleiding tot kommer baar. Dit is asof die jeugopstand van vandag gepaard gaan met 'n element van sinisme, ontnugtering en gevolglike verbeterheid wat vroeër bykans onbekend was. 'n Mens kry al hoe meer die gevoel dat dit hier nie maar net meer om 'n natuurlike en gesonde opstuwung van jong bloed gaan nie, dog dat daar êrens 'n groot skroef los is. Die jeug van vandag is skynbaar nie slegs in — verstaanbare — opstand teen die ouer garde nie: in sy diepste hart het hy, so wil dit voorkom, die ouer garde en die hele „establishment" wat hulle verteenwoordig, reeds feitlik finaal as onbekeerbaar en onredbaar afgeskryf met 'n ontpiese gees van ontnugterde pessimisme en wêreldmoegheid wat grens aan die nihilistiese en die anargiese.

Afgesien van hierdie onheilspellende nuwe kenmerk van die hedendaagse opstand onder die jeug, is daar nog 'n paar ander karaktertrekke wat 'n mens opval. Itemsgewyse kan hulle as volg opgesom word:

(1) Ons het dit nie slegs meer te doen met sporadiese en gelokaliseerde opflikkerings van opstand onder die jeug nie; dit is blykbaar 'n wêreldwye en al hoe meer gekoördineerde gronddeining wat besig is om voor ons verbysterde oë op te dein.

(2) Dit is nie maar net die jeug in hul jeugdigheid as sodanig wat besig is om in opstand te kom nie, dog spesifiek die denkende jeug, die studerende jeug, die intelligentsia onder die jeug, diegene wat die ontnugterde ouer garde sou kon beskou het as die „room van die oes" wat juis deur hulle — sekerlik niemand anders nie! — gesaa is.

(3) Gevolglik gaan die opstand nie oor — soos 'n mens van die jeug sou kon verwag het — selfsugtige persoonlike frustrasies nie. Dit is nie die natuurlike opstand van die opgeskote seun teen sy ouers omdat hy self reeds langbroek wil dra, grootmens wil wees en dit hom nog nie toegelaat word nie. Hierdie opstand gaan oor ewige beginsels: oor vryheid en onreg en armoede, oor waarheid en geregtigheid en liefde — oor dié „grootmensverantwoordelikhede" wat die grootmense na die oordeel van ons tragies vroegrype jeug skromelik verontagsaam en verwaarloos het.

(4) Dit is dan ook nie verbasend nie dat, hoewel veel van die moderne jeugopstand 'n vanselfsprekende en onvermydelike politieke kleur dra, dit sy mees ingrypende en uitgesproke uiting vind op die allerdiepste vlak van menslike sekerheid en onsekerheid—die vlak van die godsdienstige en kerklike lewe. En dan is dit nie slegs een of twee kerke wat daarby betrokke is nie, dog almal oor die hele kerkspektrum heen, vanaf die Roomse tot by die suiwerste gereformeerde kerk.

Veral hierdie laasgenoemde aspek van die verskynsel interesseer ons en noop tot ernstige besinning. Want wanneer die jeug begin twyfel aan die dikwels eeuelank gevestigde kerke en die wyse waarop hulle die godsdiens bedrywe, is dit 'n opstand nie alleen teen die huidige ouer geslag nie, maar teen 'n hele reeks ouer geslagte, teen die

naspeurbare verloop van die kerkgeskiedenis self; dan kan dit uiteindelik vir die kerk alleen maar net inhou 'n ontwrigting en breekslag minstens so traumaties as die 16de eeuse Hervorming self. Want ons huidige jeug is die ouer geslag van môre, en hul godsdienstfrustrasies van vandag moet onvermydelik lei tot die kerkhervorming (of -vervorming) van die toekoms.

Dit betaam ons dus om onself in alle erns te begin afvra: Hoe diep loop hierdie stroom van onvergenoegdheid, onrus en opstand werklik?

Nog bloot oppervlakkige navraag en navorsing i.v.m. hierdie vraag het ons reeds daarvan oortuig dat die antwoord alles behalwe 'n gerusstellende is. Die kanker het reeds veel dieper ingevreet as wat baie van ons selfversekerde kerkleiers in hul mees swarmoedige buie sou kon vermoed.

Toegegee dat baie van die neweverskynsels van die huidige opstand onder ons jeug ter syde gestel kan word as blote moedswilligheid, uittarting of selfs loutere stuitigheid. Toegegee dat sommige vorms wat dié opstand aanneem, met 'n mate van reg bestempel kan word as naïef, onbeholpe, oningelig en wesenlik kinderagtig. Toegegee dat daar veel is waaraan 'n uiteraard konserwatiewe ouer geslag terdeë geregtig is om aanstoot te neem. Dan bly daar nog in die diepste wortel van hierdie ontstellende nuwe verkynsel iets wat omgeef is van onomstootlike waarheid; iets wat wesenlik en uit die hart is; iets wat onweerstaanbaar aandring op 'n werklik bevredigende antwoord; 'n onbevredigde geroep om hulp deur werklike diep behoeftes wat ons onverbiddelik dwing om die hand in eie boesem te steek.

Het ons opstandige jeug van vandag nie tog iets wesenliks beet nie? Is hulle so ver uit die kol wanneer hulle beweer dat ons gevestigde kerke verkrampt en vasgevang in die keurslyf van hul eie institusionalisme geraak het? Wanneer hulle prouit verklaar dat geboue van steen en sement deesdae 'n groter rol speel as onsterflike mensesiele? Wanneer hulle in opstand kom teen die holheid, niksseggenheid en betekenisloosheid van ons amp telike prediking en verskillende kerklike rituele? Wanneer hulle daarop aandring dat die godsdienst van die gemeentes waartoe hulle behoort, vir hulle praktiese sin begin maak? Wanneer hulle totaal ergerlik begin raak met 'n godsdienst wat hom hewig bekommer oor die heerlikhede van die hiernamaals dog sienderoë die skreiende onreg wat voortwoed in hierdie ondermaanse wêreld toelaat en, ergste nog, vergoelik en regverdig met oordeel-

kundige verwringing van die Heilige Skrif? Wanneer die liefde as hoogste goed so meevoerend gepredik word en so selde in die praktyk beoefen word?

Dur! ons ons werklik met verontwaardigde verbasing verstom oor die heftigheid van ons jeug se opstandigheid: 'n heftige opstand wat lank nie meer positief bepaal word slegs deur die natuurlik opwellende drif van die jeug nie, maar wel in sy diepste wortel negatief bepaal word deur ons vrome dog wesenlik siniese en liefdelose skynheiligheid, waarteen die opstuwende idealisme van ons jongmense nie anders kan as om te rebelleer nie?

Dit betaam ons dan ook om minder neerhalend en selfs smalend te oordeel oor ons opstandige jeug: om nie so maklik te verdoem nie, dog eerder om te probeer verstaan, meelee — en help. Hoe opstandig hulle naamlik ook al juis teenoor óns mag wees, bly hulle nogtans nog steeds óns kinders, óns verantwoordelike. En hoe opstandig hulle teen ons mag wees, is juis hulle ook skrypend bewus daarvan dat hulle óns kinders is en lê daar aan die diepste wortel van hulle opstand 'n wanhopige harteroop om óns hulp en leiding.

Dit het tyd geword dat ons ons minder verwaand en gewaand meerderwaardig sal gedra: dat ons ons jeug nie langer sal ignoreer, versmaai en opsetlik verkleiner nie, dog hulle in ons vertrouwe sal begin neem. Want in 'n wêreld wat leef onder die Damokles-swaard van 'n kernoorlog en waarin onreg en die onmenslikheid van mens teenoor mens steeds groter afmetings aanneem, word ons jeug ou mense groot.

Andersyds is veel van hulle opstand teen ons eenvoudig toe te skrywe aan onervarenheid en onkunde omtrent die ingewikkeldheid van die probleme waarmee ons as 'n ouer geslag te kampe het. Eintlik smag hulle hartstogtelik na die natuurlike hulp en leiding wat van ons na hulle behoort uit te gaan — en wat hulle nie meer werklik ontvang nie. Eintlik smag ons net so hartstogtelik na hul agting, liefde en jeugdige ondersteuning — en verydel ons dit met ons veroordeling.

As ons jeug vir ons in toenemende mate siek begin lyk, is dit 'n siekteverskynsel van ons hele samelewing. En ons samelewing is wat óns daarvan gemaak het, of deur ons verwaarlosing of angvallige konformitiese lafaardy laat ontstaan het. Dit is juis oor dié samelewing dat ons jongmense hulle tot so 'n mate bekommer dat hulle tot daadwerklike opstand, hoe skynbaar sinneloos ook al, gekom het.

Youth Rebellion

Dr. W. B. DE VILLIERS

More and more news is reaching us about flare-ups of the apparently universal rebelliousness of modern youth. Overseas universities are being plagued by a growing tide of student revolts and a mighty country such as France was practically paralysed last year by riots which had their origin among the student youth. According to reports from the U.S.A. it would seem that even Pres. Nixon is now becoming actively concerned about the university riots which are beginning to occur on such

a scale that they have already become one of the most burning national issues.

To judge by recent and mounting reports, also we here in South Africa are not going to escape the problem. It is of no real importance whether the phenomenon has blown over here from overseas or whether it is the product of a kind of spontaneous spiritual combustion among our own young people. What is of remarkable significance, is that the phenomenon has undoubtedly already taken firm root

in this country and that it is busy growing to an alarming extent. Apparently the time is past for us to be able to dismiss the rebelliousness among our own youth with a deprecatory shrug of the shoulder or deliberately to look the other way in the hope that it will wane and disappear of its own accord.

With distressing regularity the reports are now following one upon the other, all pointing to a growing unrest especially among our student youth: a poster demonstration here; a street procession there; a delegation of students protesting to a minister of state; somewhere an experimental worship service with unusual psychedelic side-effects.

And then there are also of course, the unmistakable symptoms of sickness by which the whole rebellion is inevitably accompanied in some circles: the increasing sexual licence among our youth, the growing addiction to drugs, the rise in homosexuality and lesbianism, the deliberate "drop-outs" from society, the alarming number of youthful suicides and acts of crime.

Not everything in connection with this present-day rebellion among the youth is inherently and necessarily alarming, of course. On the contrary: it would indeed be alarming if our modern South African youth were **not** rebellious at all under present circumstances. The years of our youth are, after all, normally the period of **Sturm und Drang** and passionate revolt against the existing order has through all the centuries been the most typical symptom of a healthy ripening process with man. In a certain sense, therefore, we can only welcome the present rebelliousness among the youth, especially in a country and among a community where blind veneration of tradition, obsequious conformism and an unquestioning acceptance of authority have undoubtedly already assumed pathological dimensions.

Nevertheless, the apparently deliberately bizarre acts, the obvious mischievousness and the barely disguised provocativeness which so often characterise the present-day rebellion represent a **novum** which gives cause for concern. It is as if the youth of today is associated with an element of cynicism, disillusionment and resultant inexorability which was practically unknown in the past. One increasingly senses that it is no longer just a matter of young blood rushing to the head in a natural and healthy fashion, but that there is something seriously wrong somewhere. The youth of today is evidently no longer in — understandable — revolt against the elder generation: deep in its heart it has, so it would seem, already more or less finally written off as unconvertible and beyond salvation the elder generation and the whole "establishment" they represent, with an uncharacteristic spirit of disillusioned pessimism and world-weariness which borders upon the nihilistic and the anarchic.

Apart from this ominous new attribute of the present-day rebellion among the younger generation, there are yet a few other characteristics which strike one. They can be specifically summed up as follows:

(1) We are no longer merely confronted by sporadic and localised flare-ups of the rebellion among the youth: it is apparently a worldwide and ever

better co-ordinated ground-swell which is surging up before our bewildered eyes.

(2) It is not merely youth in their youthfulness as such who are in revolt, but specifically thinking youth, the student youth, the intelligentsia among the youth, those whom the disillusioned elder generation might well have regarded as the "pick of the crop", planted by themselves — certainly by nobody else!

(3) Consequently the rebellion is not caused — as one would have expected of the youth — by selfish personal frustrations. It is not the natural rebellion of the teenager against his parents because he himself already wants to don long pants, wants to be grown-up, and it is not yet allowed him. This rebellion concerns itself with eternal principles: with freedom and injustice and poverty, with truth and righteousness and love — with those "grown-up responsibilities" which the grown-ups have, in the judgment of our tragically precocious youth, solely disregarded and neglected.

(4) It is also not surprising, therefore, that, although much of the modern youth rebellion obviously and inevitably carries a political taint, it finds its most profound and articulate expression on the very deepest plane of human certainty and uncertainty: the plane of religious and ecclesiastical existence. And then it is not only one or two churches that are involved, but all of them, ranging across the whole denominational spectrum, from the Roman Catholic to the purest Reformed Church.

Especially this last aspect of the phenomenon interests us and compels us to give the matter serious thought. For when the younger generation starts having doubts about churches which have frequently been established for centuries and about the way in which they are practising religion, it is a revolt not only against the present elder generation, but against a whole series of elder generations, against the traceable process of church history itself; then it can ultimately only spell for the Church a disruption and breach at least as traumatic as the 16th century Reformation itself. For our present younger generation is the elder generation of to-morrow, and their religious frustrations of today must inevitably lead to the Church reformation (or deformation) of tomorrow.

It befits us, therefore, to start asking ourselves in all seriousness: how deep does this stream of discontent, unrest and rebellion flow in reality?

After merely superficial enquiry and research concerning this question we are already convinced that the answer is anything but a reassuring one. The cancer has already eaten away deeper than many of our self-assured church leaders could surmise in their most melancholy moods.

Granted that many of the side aspects of the present rebellion among the youth can be dismissed as mere mischievousness, provocation or even as pure frivolousness. Granted that some of the forms this rebellion takes can with a measure of justice be regarded as naïve, clumsy, uninformed and basically childish. Granted that there is much at which an inherently conservative elder generation is thoroughly entitled to take offence. Then still there remains at the deepest root of this alarming new phenomenon something redolent of irrefutable truth; some-

thing which irresistibly demands a truly satisfying answer; an unsatisfied call for help from those truly in need which compels us to search our own hearts.

Do the rebellious youth of our time not in fact have hold of something essential? Are they so far off the mark when they allege that our established churches have become muscle-bound and caught up in the straitjacket of their own institutionalism? When they flatly state that buildings of brick and mortar are playing a greater rôle these days than immortal human souls? When they start rebelling against the hollowness, nonsensicality and meaninglessness of our official preaching and various ecclesiastical rituals? When they insist that the religion of the various congregations to which they belong should start making some practical sense to them also?

When they are becoming completely brownd off with a religion which anxiously concerns itself about the joys of the hereafter, but which is blithely allowing the crying injustice which rages on in this mundane world of ours to continue and, even worse, glosses over and justifies it with judicious distortions of Holy Scripture? When love is so compellingly proclaimed to be the highest good and is so seldom really practised?

Dare we really stand indignantly surprised at the vehemence of the rebelliousness of our youth: a vehement rebellion which has long since ceased to be positively determined only by the natural upsurge of youthful fervour, but which is, at its deepest root, being negatively determined by our pious though essentially cynical and loveless hypocrisy, against which the fervent idealism of our youth cannot but rebel.

It also befits us, then, to judge less disparagingly and even sneeringly about our rebellious youth: not

to condemn so easily, but rather to try and understand, sympathise — and help. For however rebellious they may be towards us, they still remain **our** children, **our** responsibility. And however rebellious **they** may be towards us, **they** are the ones who are also painfully aware that they are **our** children, and at the deepest root of their rebellion there lies a desperate cry of the heart for **our** help and guidance.

It has become time for us to behave in a less overweening and conceitedly superior fashion: no longer to ignore, scorn and deliberately to belittle our younger generation, but to start taking them into our confidence. For in a world that lives under the Damocles' sword of a nuclear holocaust and in which injustice and the inhumanity of man to man are assuming ever greater dimensions, our youth are growing up as old men.

On the other hand, much of their rebellion against us can simply be attributed to their lack of experience and their ignorance concerning the complexity of the problems with which we as an older generation help and deal. They are actually passionately longing for the natural help and guidance which ought to go out from us to them — and which they are no longer really receiving. We are actually passionately longing for their respect, love and youthful support — and are foiling it with our condemnations.

If our youth are starting to look increasingly sick to us, it is a symptom of the sickness of our whole society. And our society is what we have made of it, or what we have allowed to come about by our neglect or anxiously conformist cowardice. It is about this very society that our young people are concerned to such an extent that they have resorted, however apparently senselessly, to actual rebellion.

CALVYN WAS NIE 'N NASIONALIS NIE

Prof. Dr. ALBERT GEYSER

Op sporadiese opslae na lyk die verkrampte-verligte deining nou amper oor. Maar wat nog lank sal nalewe, is die aanspraak wat hierdie politiek-gemotiveerde mense op Calvyn maak vir hul verregaande stellings.

Hoe ver hul van Calvyn afwyk sal blyk as ons hulle beskouing in hooflyne uitstippel, en daarteenoor stel wat Calvyn in werklikheid gesê het.

Volgens *Hoofstad* van die 11de April het dr. A. P. Treurnicht die vorige dag op Potchefstroom die volgende aan Calvyn ontleen:

die beleid van afsonderlike ontwikkeling;
die Afrikaner Calvinis se afkeer van „verbastering” (blykbaar in die Bybelvreemde betekenis van rassevermenging) as Godloë-nend;
ywer vir Afrikaner-eenheid;
afkeer van die liberalistiese mis-

kenning van Afrikaner-nasionalisme;

afkeer ewe-eens van koalisie tussen Afrikaners en hul Engelssprekende landgenote;

skeiding tussen kerk en staat, godsdiens en politiek, godsdiens en opvoeding is liberalisties en anti-Calvinisties.

Behoudens die laaste stelling wat ook maar net min of meer korrek aan Calvyn ontleen is, kan nie een van hierdie stellings aan Calvyn ontleen word nie. Òf die hervormer het dit in die verste verte nie gesê nie, òf — en dit in die merendeel van die gevalle — hy het presies die teenoorgestelde gesê as wat dr. Treurnicht hom wil laat sê. Ons sal dit wel-

dra met teks en kapittel uit Calvyn se werke bewys.

Ergste is nog wel nie dat dr. Treurnicht hierdie bewerings op naam van Calvyn geplaas het nie, maar dat dr. A. Hertzog, blykbaar vertrouend op dr. Treurnicht, 'n paar dae later in die parlement hierdie beskouing gebruik het — weereens met 'n beroep op Calvyn — om die Afrikaner en hul Engelssprekende landgenote teen mekaar af te weeg tot beledigende en verkleinerende nadeel van die laastes.

Dr. Hertzog het volgens *Die Transvaler* van die 15de April gesê:

Die Afrikaner is Calvinisties, maar die Engelssprekende is liberalisties en weerloos teen die Kommunisme; die Afrikaner onderwerp hom aan die

owerheid en tree sterk op teen mense wat hul teen gesag verset (doen die Engelssprekendes dit dan nie?); die Calvinistiese Afrikaner soek volks- en persoonlike vryheid, en waardeur sy en ander groepe se volkseie.

NIE WAAR

Party van hierdie sieninge mag waar wees van party Afrikaners, en mede-nasionaliste het dr. Hertzog se siening oor die Engelssprekendes as onwaar verwerp. Wat nie waar is nie, is dat Calvin sulke goed gesê het. Dr. Hertzog kan dit nie by Calvin vind nie, en dit lyk of hy dit aan dr. Treurnicht se ongegronde weergawe van Calvin ontleen het. Calvin self, sover hy hierdie onderwerpe aanraak, sê deurgaans presies die teenoorgestelde van wat dr. Hertzog, volgens *Die Transvaler*, in die Parlement gesê het.

Mens kan die bont skakering van beweringe van drs. Treurnicht en Hertzog, telkens op naam van Calvin, terugvoer tot één begrip; 'n eng, eksklusiewe nasionalisme wat in sy selfverheeliking elke andersoortige mens, angsvallig uit die eie kring uitsluit as volksvyandig, of ten beste volkskadelik.

Vir hierdie nasionalisme het Calvin geen goeie woord nie en hy en sy vlugteling-volgelingen in Genève het twintig jaar lank swaar gely onder hierdie soort nasionaliste. Natuurlik het Calvin nie die woorde „nasionalisme” en „nasionaliste” gebesig nie, want die woorde het nog nie bestaan nie, maar die begrippe het wel bestaan en Calvin het hulle in duidelike taal betry.

Buitendien moet drs. Treurnicht en Hertzog onthou dat Calvin geen oomblik begaan was oor die behoud van die Franse of Switserse identiteit nie, of hulle heerskappy oor enige ander volksgroep nie, maar oor die universele heerskappy van Christus oor alle mense, ongeag die groep waarin hulle gebore is, of die posisie wat hul bekleet het.

EENHEID EN SOLIDARITEIT

Teenoor die versnipperende eksklusiwiteit van die nasionalisme benadruk Calvin die eenheid en solidariteit en onderlinge afhanklikheid van die mensdom soos deur God geskape en deur Hom gewil.

„Die menslike geslag is saam verbind deur 'n heilige band van gemeenskap. Almal is almal se naastes. Sodat elkeen ons naaste is, is dit genoeg dat hy mens is; want ons het nie die reg om ons gemeenskaplike natuur uit te wis nie.” (Calvin,

Kommentaar op die Nuwe Testament. Luk. 10:30).

„Die Bybel bewys dat die mense gebore is die een vir die ander, en dat hulle by gevolg onderling met mekaar omgang moet hê ten einde die gemeenskap van die menslike geslag te bestendig”. (Calvin, Kommentaar op Ex. 22:25).

„En nou dat ons sien dat God die menslike geslag so geskape het, dat ons saamverbonde sal wees, en dat niemand homself en sy vermoëns moet spaar nie, maar dat ons al ons vermoëns moet bydra om alles tot gemeenskap te laat dien, moet ons nie aangespoor wees tot so 'n mededeelsaamheid nie?” (Preek oor I Kor. 11:11-16. Opera Calvini. Tome XLIX p. 740).

„God het gewil dat ons almal voortkom uit dieselfde fontein, sodat ons des te groter behoefte aan onderlinge onderhoud en eenstemmigheid sal hê, en dat ons die een die ander sal omhels soos ons eie vlees . . . En wat die ongelykheid betref, wat strydig is met sy bedoeling, dis niks anders as 'n korrupsie wat uit die sonde voortkom nie” (Calvin, Kommentaar op Gen. 1:27).

„God wil dat daar so 'n analogie en gelykheid tussen ons sal wees, dat elkeen die behoefdiges volgens sy vermoë sal bystaan, sodat party nie oorfloed sal hê en die ander gebrek ly nie”. Hierdie uitspraak kom nie van Marx of Lenin nie, maar van Calvin in sy Kommentaar op die Nuwe Testament, II Kor. 8:13.

„Laat ons dan verstaan dat, terwyl God ons so aan mekaar verbind het, elkeen aanspreeklik is vir sy naaste. As God ons apart wou hou, sou ons nie hierdie noodsaak gehad het wat ons verplig om met mekaar omgang te maak nie. Ons moet daar kom om te erken dat God ons ledemate van één liggaam wou maak. En net soos die oog nie sonder die voet kan klaarkom nie, en die hand sonder die oor, en die mond sonder die maag, so ook kan ons, groot en klein, ons nie met ons eie persoon tevrede stel nie, maar ons moet verenig wees en daar moet 'n onderlinge band van broederskap tussen ons bestaan. Wanneer ons hierdie inagneming het, sal elkeen besluit: Ek sien my naaste wat behoefte aan my het. As ekself in sulke nood was, sou ek gehelp wou wees. Ek moet daarom netso aan hom doen. Kortweg, hierdie omgang met mekaar waarvan Paulus hier praat, is daardie broederliefde wat ontstaan uit die (weersydse) inagneming wat ons daaruit het dat God ons saamge-

bind het en dat Hy ons verenig het soos in één liggaam, en dat dit sy wil is dat ons vir ons naaste sal inspan, en dat niemand verknog sal wees aan sy eie nie . . .” (Calvin, Preek CXLI op Deut. 24:19-22. Opera Calvini. Tome XXVIII. p. 206).

In die gemeenskap van Jesus Christus is daar nie meer skeiding tussen mens en mens op grond van nasionaliteit nie, want Hy het die groot en oorspronklike menslike solidariteit tussen die nasies herstel. „God wys dat hy die mensdom wil bewaar, so dat Hy nie wil toelaat dat die mees vreemde en mees onbekende blootgestel sal wees aan die geweldpleging van kwaadwilliges nie . . .” (Calvin, Kommentaar op Lev. 24:22 en Kommentaar op Mt. 8:11).

„God kom na vore as die skild en beskermmer van die vreemdeling, as mense hul kwaad wil aandoen”. (Calvin, Kommentaar op Ex. 22:21-22).

„Let ook daarop dat God gebied dat elkeen die vreemdeling so lief as Homself moet hê. Want daaruit is dit duidelik dat die naam „naaste” nie beperk is tot familie en bure en bekendes nie, maar uitstrek tot die ganse mensdom, soos Jesus Christus dit bewys in die persoon van die Samaritaan . . .” (Calvin, Kommentaar op Ex. 22:21-24).

NASIONALISME

Dis op grond van hierdie universalisme, dat Calvin met alle krag gestry het teen die nasionaliste van Genève, wat die „vreemdelinge” wou uitban uit hul kerk en maatskappy. Weens die godsdienstige vervolginge in hul tuisland het sedert 1530 en tot teen 1560 talle Franse na Switserland gevlug — met name na Genève. Hulle was meestal begaaf, karaktervas en dikwels ook gegoed. Deur hul bekwaamheid het hulle die Geneefse ekonomie 'n groot stoot vorentoe gegee en self in aansien toegeneem. Dit het lede van die ingesete politieke elite met afguns vervul.

Onder leiding van nogal voormalige medestanders van Calvin, „Calviniste” dus, het toe 'n aksie ontstaan omdat hierdie „vreemdelinge” die ingesetenes wou onderploeg, „nasionaliste” dus. Hierdie nasionaliste van Genève het toe (tipies, is dit nie?) met 'n smeerkampanje, 'n fluisterkampanje en walgooiery teen die „vreemdelinge” begin. Hulle het by die Raad van Genève aangedring om burgerskap aan die mense te onthou, en om die preke van die Franse hervormers te sensureer ten einde hul monde te stop en sodoende hul invloed te breek.

Hierdie voormalige medestanders van Calvyn was Jean Philippe, Pierre Vandel en Ami Perrin. Hoe hulle te werk en tekere gegaan het kan elkeen lees in Doumergue se gesaghebbende werk oor Calvyn, of in die onlangs verskene boek van dr. A. Biéler, *La Pensée Economique et Sociale de Calvin*, Librairie de l'Université, Genève, 1961.

Namate Calvyn se gesag toegeneem en die posisie van die Franse Protestante in Genève verbeter het, het die vyandigheid en verkramptheid van hierdie drie manne gegroei. Hulle het rondgefluister dat hierdie „vreemdelinge” en ook Calvyn die politieke en kerklike mag van mekaar wil skei, en dat hulle daarom on-Christelik-nasionaal is en dus volksvyandig of ten beste volksskadelik. Hulle versoek daarom hul regering om kragdadig op te tree en by die kerklike geloofs-belydenis van die Reformatore nog ’n artikel te voeg wat ’n eed van getrouheid aan die owerheid behels. Calvyn het onmiddellik en met welslae by die Raad hierteen geprotesteer.

SMEERTAKTIEK

Toe begin die smeertaktiek en verdagmakery eers: die Franse Protestante te Genève is niks anders as werktuie vir Frans I se maneuvres teen Genève nie. Dis in belang van die godsdiens en volk dat hul kleingeld gemaak word. Perrin se smeer-kampanje en bangmaakstories het hom ’n setel in die Raad besorg, en daar het hy nie gerus voordat Calvyn en sy geesgenote uit die stad verban is nie. Dit was in 1538.

Smeersuksesse duur nie lank nie, en in 1541 het die stad Calvyn gevra

om terug te kom. ’n Gelyktydige nuwe vlaag Franse vlugteling plus die koms van Calvyn het ongelukkig nuwe energie aan Perrin se Christelik-nasionale verset gegee. Nou was die verwyd dat die vreemdelinge nie patrioties is nie. Natuurlik nie, hulle het dan uit trou aan die Evangelie en hul gewetensvryheid, hul vaderland verlaat en na Genève gevlug!

Ami Perrin, voormalige medestander van Calvyn en politieke opgangmaker in troebel tye, het toe die jeug teen die Reformatore begin opsweep, en amper was daar fisieke geweld. Die Raad het egter ferm opgetree en Perrin se politieke aansien het ’n knou gekry. Maar toe tree ’n ander voormalige medestander van Calvyn, Vandel, na vore met ’n fyn plan. Uit besorgdheid oor die godsdiens en belange van die volk rig hy hom tot die Raad van Genève met ’n voorstel dat die predikers hulle preke vóór lewering aan ’n sensuur-raad moet voorlê. Hy het beoog om hul sodoende die mond te stop.

Die plan het ook nie geslaag nie, en al wat Perrin en Vandel nog kon doen, was om met hernude ywer smeer- en bangmaakstories teen die „vreemdelinge” onder die gepeupel te versprei. Daarin het hulle geslaag, en talle „vreemdelinge” is selfs op straat onskuldig te lyf gegaan. ’n Tydgenootelike skrywer, A. Froment, vertel in sy *Le Livre la Sédition* van 1555 hoe hierdie yweraars vir kerk, volk en vaderland te werk gegaan het. „Franse ballinge, Franse boewe,” het hulle geskree, „wat kom soek julle hier? Kom julle ons goed opvreet? Waarom bly julle nie

in jul eie land in stede van hier te kom ryk word nie?” En verder: „Hierdie Franse vreemdelinge wil hier kom maak of hulle in Parys is . . .”

Toe hulle aanstigting so ver gegaan het dat hulle met die vinger na die Franse vlugteling wys en skree, „maak dood, maak dood,” en die straatvolk steeds meer die arme mense te lyf begin gaan, het die Reformatore ’n klag teen hulle by die Raad gelê. Uit ondersoek het toe aan die lig gekom dat Perrin en kie selfs in die geheim ’n staatsgreep beplan het, en hulle wou dit so uitvoer dat die wanorde wat sou ontstaan, ten laste van die „vreemdelinge” gelê sou word.

MISBRUIK VAN GODSDIENS

Van al hierdie politiek-godsdiens-tige pogings merk Biéler op: „Dis kenmerkend van die nasionalisme dat dit die godsdiens van die volk inspan om sy politieke doelwitte te bereik . . . deur homself voor te gee as verdediger van die geloof”. (*La Pensée Economique et Sociale de Calvin*, p. 114).

Dr. Treurnicht en dr. Hertzog en hul mede-„Calviniste” kan ook met voordeel luister na die raad van die beste Calvyn-kenner van ons eeu, Karl Barth: „Ons herken in Calvyn ’n voorbeeld of ’n model slegs in die mate dat hy op ’n onvergeetlike wyse die weg van gehoorsaamheid getoon het aan die kerk van sy tyd: ’n gehoorsaamheid in gedagtes en in daade, sosiale en politieke gehoorsaamheid. ’n Ware dissipel van Calvyn kan net één weg volg: gehoorsaam wees, nie aan Calvyn nie, maar aan Hom wat die Meester van Calvyn was”.

'Endorsement out' of religious workers to their Homelands

MARK COLLIER

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this article is to present a phenomenon and to raise some questions that follow in its wake.

We are all aware of the process in certain parts of our country of returning people to their 'homelands'. This process of "endorsing-out" Africans is justified in order to make the Republic "less African" and so "more White". However, the phenomenon that many are not aware of is the returning of religious workers back to their homelands. We suggest that here the process is one of making us "theologically less critical" and hence "theologically more conformist". For all the people known to us who have been thus discriminated against have in one way or another questioned or criticised both in word and/or deed the underlying assumptions upon which our society is said to be built. They have questioned in different ways the theological, philosophical and sociological premises upon which the ideology of separate development rests.

We do not believe that the Church itself is necessarily being persecuted, but that people within the Church are being acted against. Nor do we believe that they should not have been acted against if the reasons for the action were valid, known, and, if necessary, had been tried in court. But we seriously question whether there is the freedom of religion, thought, conscience and expression which we all claim for ourselves. We would also question the State's right to define the boundaries of these free-

doms and arbitrarily demarcate the areas in which they may be exercised.

LEGAL POSITION

First it is necessary to state briefly the law and terms under which foreign-born religious workers came to South Africa prior to May, 1969, and how it has been amended.

The Aliens Act No. 1 of 1937 controls the residence of non-South Africans in the Republic of South Africa. Anyone who is not a South African citizen is by definition an alien. In terms of the Act aliens may enter the Republic either on a permanent residence permit or on a temporary permit.

Permit holders either of permanent residence permits or temporary permits are subject to the Admission of Persons to the Union Regulation Act No. 22 of 1913. This Act has been amended on a number of occasions and Act No. 38 of 1969, gazetted on 30th April, 1969 (No. 2370) has amended it still further. Section 22 of the Act which provides for the removal from the Republic of certain people is now amended to read:

“(3) (a) Notwithstanding anything contained in this Act or the Aliens Act, 1937 (Act No. 1 of 1937), or any other law, the Minister may, if he considers it to be in the public interest, by warrant under his hand order the removal from the Union of any person who is not a South African citizen, and thereupon such person may, pending his removal, be detained in such custody as may be prescribed by regulation.

“(b) The decision of the Minister in regard to the question whether the removal from the Union of a person referred to in paragraph (a) is or is not in the public interest shall not be subject to appeal to or review by any court of law and no person shall be entitled to be furnished with any reasons for such decision”.

This means that even those persons who hold permits under the Aliens Act may be summarily deported. The limited legal rights which any person under threat of deportation may have had in the past are to go completely. The discretion in the Minister is absolute, no reasons for the exercise of the discretion need be furnished, and the concept of the *audi alteram partem* rule has disappeared. (*Audi alteram partem* is the latin phrase for the concept that both

parties to a dispute should be heard i.e. each one should have the right to hear the evidence and arguments of the other. It also means that a person should be given an opportunity to hear the charges made against him and have the right to defend himself against them).

The regulations and policy relating to the admission of religious workers to South Africa until May 1969 was as follows:

It was not the policy of the South African Government to admit religious workers to South Africa for permanent residence.

In accordance with this policy applications for permanent residence in South Africa by religious workers were not considered by the Immigration Selection Board, Pretoria.

All South African representatives overseas were informed of this decision and were requested to advise religious workers who wished to proceed to South Africa for permanent residence not to submit applications for permanent residence, but to apply to their nearest Embassies or Legations for admission to South Africa on Aliens Temporary Permits.

In effect this meant that applications for admission to South Africa were transmitted direct to the Secretary for the Interior, Pretoria by overseas representatives. The Secretary for the Interior conveyed his decision direct to the overseas office where the application had been submitted. Applicants whose applications were successful were requested to produce their passports for visa purposes. Entry visas were not required by White persons holding passports of the United Kingdom and Colonies, Canada, Australia, Rhodesia or Ireland. Persons whose admission to South Africa was approved were then informed by letter that there was no objection to their admission to South Africa.

On arrival at a South African port of entry, an Aliens Temporary Residence Permit was issued to religious workers other than those persons holding passports of the countries mentioned previously. The permit served as proof that the holder was lawfully sojourning in the Republic.

The permit was issued subject to the conditions that the holder left the Republic and/or the Territory of South West Africa on or before the expiry date quoted on the permit, unless the validity thereof was extended, and that the holder did not

alter the purpose for which he/she was permitted to enter the Republic without the prior authority of the Department of the Interior.

On arrival, the permit was issued valid for a period of six months. Shortly before the expiry date, the permit together with the holder's passport was submitted to the nearest office of the Department of the Interior when the validity of the permit may have been extended for a further six months.

After the expiration period of each year, as from the date of entry into the Republic, the holder had to apply to the nearest Regional Representative of the Department of the Interior, at least two months before the permit was due to expire, for permission to remain in the Republic for a further period of one year. The validity of the Temporary Residence Permit could then be extended on the same basis, i.e. six monthly.

As a result of representations made to the Minister of the Interior, this procedure has now been changed. According to information released by the South African Council of Churches in May, 1969, the following policy will now be adopted:

- (a) On application, ordained church workers who are able to comply with normal entry formalities will in the first instance be admitted for an initial period of one year subject to the conditions of temporary residence permits.
- (b) On application to the Department of the Interior the validity of the temporary residence permits will be extended on a yearly basis provided the persons' presence in South Africa does not become unwanted.
- (c) After a period of four years temporary residence the persons concerned may submit applications for permanent residence in South Africa, and provided their applications are approved, they may apply for naturalization as South African citizens after five years permanent residence.
- (d) Unordained church workers will be admitted to the Republic on the same basis as other prospective Immigrants and must submit their applications to the Secretary for Immigration or his nearest representative abroad for consideration by the Immigration Selection Board.

THOSE AFFECTED

This article will only deal with some of those whose residence in South Africa has been affected. We select some, but in the process also leave out others. Some of those whom we omit for reasons of space include Miss Mary King, American Missionary of the United Church of Christ who was teaching in Natal and left in January, 1969; the Rev. de Fruyt, Belgian missionary of the Roman Catholic Church who also left in January, 1969; Miss Sally Camp, American Anglican missionary who was teaching in Ovamboland, South West Africa and left in October, 1968, and Fr. A. M. Garrison, American Anglican priest who was warden of St. Mary's Theological School in Ovamboland, South West Africa and left at the end of 1966.

Nor does this article cover those whose permission to return to or enter South Africa have been withdrawn. Among these we list Lutheran Pastor C. Fobbe, for many years missionary in the Northern Transvaal and who was refused permission to return to South Africa after returning to Germany on leave and Dr. Marie-Louise Martin (Swiss) of the Paris Evangelical Church and head of the faculty of Divinity at the University in Lesotho who has been recently refused permission to enter South Africa.

Nor does this article cover those South African clergy whose freedom to leave and return to South Africa has been affected. For example the Rev. Basil Moore, until recently Methodist chaplain to Rhodes University and first President of the University Christian Movement.

We now select some of those affected, indicating areas in which they were concerned and active. No reasons were given for the action taken against them. We offer suggestions which to us would seem possibly the reasons for which the action was taken. We would welcome a refutation by the Department of the Interior.

Bishop R. Mize, Anglican Bishop

Bishop R. Mize, an American, was ordained priest in the United States of America in 1942 and was consecrated Bishop of Damaraland, South West Africa in 1960. Bishop Mize is a known pacifist and sees his rôle as Bishop in essentially pastoral terms.

While in South West Africa he was on a temporary residence permit renewable every six months. On occasions this permit was granted for

periods shorter than six months. On 25th January, 1968 he was informed by the Secretary for the Interior that his application for a permit for permanent residence had been rejected and that as he had been over eight years in the country subject to the conditions of a temporary permit the Department could not allow him "to sojourn in the territory of South West Africa on a temporary basis". His permit was renewed for the last time for a period of six months. No reasons for this withdrawal were given.

The Anglican Archbishop of Cape Town, in consultation with the American Ambassador in Cape Town made representations for this withdrawal to be rescinded. In addition, the dean of Bishop Mize's Cathedral in Windhoek made a personal trip to Cape Town in the hope of having an interview with the Minister of the Interior as Parliament was then in session. When these attempts failed, Bishop Mize informed his diocese in May.

Leaving South West Africa at the beginning of July, he attended the world conference of Anglican bishops at Lambeth from 25th July to 25th August. While there he resigned as Bishop of Damaraland, effective from 31st August, and accepted an invitation of the Bishop of Matabeleland to be his assistant Bishop with special charge for the archdeanery of Botswana.

Upon arriving in the United States on 28th August he was asked to contact the U.S. State Department. They informed him that the South African Government had returned a decision through the American Ambassador in Cape Town in which they conveyed their willingness to allow him to immediately return to South West Africa subject to two conditions. First that he "state in public that some of his actions since he came to South West Africa were such that it might have been assumed or might have created the impression that he had concerned himself with political matters beyond the scope of his ecclesiastical duties". And secondly "that he in future refrain from such acts."

Perhaps the actions that could have been misconstrued were the occasional letters he wrote to Anglican Ovambo refugees over a number of years. These were mainly educational refugees and all the correspondence was of an essentially pastoral nature. It was his practice to see that Angli-

in touch with the Church in the area cans leaving his diocese were kept of their new abode. He naturally also wrote letters, when occasion demanded, about their personal and family needs.

Given the political situation at that time — only in July, 1966 the International Court of Justice had delivered judgment in respect of South Africa's administration of its mandate over South West Africa — his correspondence could have been misinterpreted. However, as this correspondence was within the framework of the pastoral fulfilment of his rôle as Bishop and fell within the ambit of his duty, he could make no such guarantee about the future.

Fr. Ian Atkinson, Anglican Priest

Fr. Atkinson was born in England and ordained there in 1958. He served there for nine years until coming to South Africa in June, 1967. Fr. Atkinson served at St. Alban's Cathedral, Pretoria.

On 22nd July, 1968 he returned to England on a 90 days' return air ticket. As a result of representations made before his departure, the Department of the Interior informed him by letter dated 31st July, 1968, that his "temporary residence in the Republic (had) been approved until the 16th July, 1969". Furthermore it was pointed out that the letter could be retained as proof that his residence in the Republic for the above-mentioned period had been authorised.

Wishing to return to South Africa on the 18th October, he received a registered airmail letter from the Department of the Interior on the 2nd October, 1968. In this letter the Minister withdrew the exemptions granted under the Aliens Act to citizens of the United Kingdom. (In terms of these exemptions they are permitted to enter and sojourn in the Republic without being in possession of an Aliens Temporary Permit).

Similarly, the exemption from visa requirements as laid down in the Admission of Persons to the Union Regulation Act (as amended) was also withdrawn. The withdrawal of these exemptions therefore required possession of an entry visa as well as an Aliens Temporary Permit before entry into the Republic. It also stated that visa applications must be made "well in advance of any contemplated visit" and should he arrive at a South African port of entry without a visa he would not be permitted to enter.

Application to the South African Consul-General in London for a visa was unsuccessful. The Consul-General's letter of the 12th November states that "no reasons for the decision were given."

Fr. Atkinson's reactions to this refusal can best be related in his own words. "I had weighed as best I could the cost of being a Christian and a priest in South Africa and faced the awful fears and frustrations and tensions which living with open eyes and ears in an Apartheid dominated (multi-racial) society force upon one. Tensions which are heavy enough for me to feel, in one sense, relieved. I don't have to return to them. Yet I had decided that I could and must pay the cost of Christian involvement. But I love South Africa and still have a longing to be back with the people of that country.

"And, of course, in a sense, I am bitter and angry — I am no political crusader — though I do make judgments and had fifteen years of fairly extensive reading behind me. All I wanted to do was to serve people and enable reconciliation and a fuller life, and I am condemned for that. Yes, of course, I feel bitter and hurt. What kind of a Christian Government is it that makes decisions of this kind? Well I know the answer of course and anyway it is the pain that is uppermost. The pain of being cut off from what one was seeking to give oneself to, the pain of close friends deserted, of possibilities in which one can have no hope of sharing with others. Then finally a great compassion for all who are caught up in the situation, and largely powerless (even if they wished to do differently) to do anything effective because the fears and controls are so strong".

But why was Fr. Atkinson's permit, granted on 31st July, withdrawn on 2nd October. What happened in these two months while he was on holiday with his family in England? Surely nothing that he did, as he was spending most of his time studying physics, preparatory to a B.Sc. course he had enrolled for with the University of Natal.

On the 20th September, twelve days before his permit was withdrawn, the South African Council of Churches issued its "Message to the People of South Africa". This document, sent to every clergyman in the country, was a strongly worded theological statement stressing the irreconcilability of the Gospel with

the policy of separate development. This document was prepared by a Theological Commission set up by the Council and it was issued in the name of the Council.

Is this the reason for this action? But should this be so, how arbitrary can State action be to penalise a man for a document he had no hand in formulating.

Or was this an attempt to penalise the Anglican Church? Or an object lesson for foreign-born clergy? Or an attempt to expose churches with a preponderance of foreign-born clergy to their vulnerability?

Who knows?

Fr. P. Dil, Anglican Priest

Fr. Dil was born in Haarlem, Holland in 1937 and came to South Africa in 1957 under contract with the Netherlands Bank of S.A. Ltd. After becoming a Christian and on completing his contract, he entered a multi-racial Theological College in Cape Town which has since been closed. Here more than elsewhere he became aware of the full damage of discrimination to a man's dignity. He was ordained a priest in 1964. His wife Wenda is South African and they have two young children.

He held a permanent residence visa and held a population registration card. Twice while living in Pretoria, he applied for citizenship. On neither occasion was the application acknowledged, replied to or refused. Furthermore he twice wished to visit Holland, but on neither occasion could he obtain a guarantee of re-entry permit before leaving. This despite the fact that on one occasion his father was dying as the result of a brain haemorrhage. No reasons were given for this refusal.

Fr. Dil was chairman of the Pretoria Area Committee of Kupugani and chairman of the Christian Fellowship, a multi-racial group in Pretoria. He also assisted in the visit to South Africa of Dr. Martin Niemöller.

Fr. Dil was a vocal and persistent campaigner against apartheid and consistently called his fellow Christians to the implications of their faith. The price of this witness was unpopularity among many of his fellow Anglicans, and ever increasing attention from the State. This attention ranged from the Department of Bantu Education urging in 1966 the owner of a Farm School for Africans, of which Fr. Dil was manager, to terminate the school's relationship with him; to the planting of an ob-

server for the Special Branch in one of his adult confirmation groups; and finally to his deportation.

This deportation order co-incided with an offence he committed against Article 47 of the Prisons Act under which communication between prisoners and the outside world through the offices of a clergyman is listed as a punishable offence. The offence was committed at the Zonderwater Prison, Pretoria. Four charges were laid, as the State maintained that four letters were conveyed through Fr. Dil. Fr. Dil pleaded guilty.

The trial took place on 11th November, 1966 at the Cullinan Magistrates Court, Pretoria. Fr. Dil was found guilty and fined R50 or 50 days imprisonment, with R25 and 25 days suspended for three years.

The first indications of charges being laid were confirmed on 27th October, 1966 by a letter from the Prisons Department. Though the trial took place only on 11th November, 1966, Fr. Dil had a deportation order served on him by the Department of the Interior on the 8th November. The deportation order was dated 1st November, 1966, ten days before the trial. The order was served in terms of section 22(3) of the Admission of Persons to the Union Regulation Act, No. 22 of 1913, as amended. This empowers the Minister of the Interior to remove any person who is not a South African citizen, "if he (the Minister) considers it to be in the public interest". Furthermore in terms of the deportation order the Minister did "not consider it to be in the public interest to disclose the reasons for his decision". The date of the deportation order followed closely on the Sunday on which Fr. Dil revealed from the pulpit of St. Alban's Cathedral, Pretoria, that the Special Branch had placed an informer in his adult confirmation group.

Was there any connection between the court-case and the deportation order? Officially not. The public prosecutor stated in court that there was no connection. He even stated that no person in this country is punished before he has been duly tried in a court.

We may make various observations from this last statement. Fr. Dil contravened a law. For reasons outside the framework of the law he did this. He admitted guilt and was punished in terms of the law. This is the cor-

rect procedure as we recognise ourselves to be subject to the law. His punishment was a fine.

- (i) Why was his deportation order served at the same time? Was it to associate in the public mind his deportation with contravention of prison regulations? If so, this clouded the issue involved. Fr. Dil must have been deported for his opposition to the ideology of separate development and not contravening the law.
- (ii) Why have no other clergymen similarly discriminated against not been brought to court? Is it because they have contravened the 'South African way of life' and not the law?
- (iii) If the State Prosecutor was correct, why do the facts as presented in this article not bear this out. Not one was brought to court. Or is deportation and withdrawal of entry permits, not a form of punishment?

Fr. R. van der Hart, Catholic Priest

Fr. R. van der Hart, 34 year old member of the Dominican Order within the Roman Catholic Church was born in Holland and came to South Africa in January, 1964 to lecture at the Roman Catholic theological seminary for African candidates to the priesthood at Hammanskraal, north of Pretoria. He lectured in philosophical theology and in contemporary thought. This post naturally flowed into his giving lectures to various university and other groups, both large and small, on matters of a philosophical and theological nature.

He served on the Theological Commission of the South African Council of Churches which was responsible for preparing "A Message to the People of South Africa". This document offers a theological critique of this country's racial policies.

He was also on the Board of Management of the Christian Institute of Southern Africa.

Being concerned about the whole problem of mass removals, he became personally involved in removal of Africans to Stinkwater, near Pretoria. He was trapped there by the police without permission and questioned.

This occurred in July, 1968 at the time his six-monthly residence permit fell due for renewal. However this was later extended for a six monthly period ending in mid-January 1969. The Roman Catholic

Church was then officially approached to co-operate with the Department of the Interior in order themselves to move Fr. van der Hart. The Department, however, were not prepared to disclose any reasons for their contemplated action. The Church vigorously refused, under these conditions, to have anything to do with the matter whatever.

Then on the 19th December, when the seminaries and universities were in recess, the Department of the Interior wrote to him stating that "in view of information at the disposal of the Department, it is felt that your continued residence in the Republic is no longer desirable". He was warned that should he fail to comply, steps would be taken against him for being in the country without authority.

Could this action have been because he was a Roman Catholic priest, or because he was on the Theological Commission, or because he was involved at Stinkwater? Was it information that was passed on by informers from his lectures? Or was it that he was teaching people to use their critical faculties and analyse the South African situation? Was this action then taken against him as a philosopher and not as a clergyman? If so, do we enjoy freedom of thought and expression?

Were any of these the reasons for the action against him? Were they none of these reasons? Were there any real reasons at all?

As a philosopher he had made a study in depth of Marxism. He was thus able to make an objective analysis of the good and bad in Marxist thought and practice. This he communicated, but especially endeavouring to communicate the art of perception and the ability to constructively criticise. This art and this ability he wanted to be brought to the South African scene.

On the eve of his departure, Fr. van der Hart wrote:

"The immigrant who manages to make only enemies in the country which he has chosen to be his new home, can expect to be turned out, and he has no reason for complaint.

"I just cannot accept that most of the people of South Africa would like to call themselves my enemies. For would I then be so mistaken in my feelings of deep friendship I have with so many among all the categories of the people of South Africa?

"I so much wanted to become a full citizen of this beautiful country,

the people of which have such a great future of true freedom, if only everybody would realise that different traditions have nothing to fear from one another, but can only enrich one another. By locking ourselves up in the so-called identity of a fixed tradition we make it impossible for ourselves to attain the freedom which Christ offers to us".

The Rev. H. A. Häselbarth, Lutheran Pastor

The Rev. H. Häselbarth was born in Germany in 1936. He studied in Tübingen, Göttingen, Bonn, Berlin and Neuendettelsau Universities, and obtained a Master's degree in 1960 from the Union Theological College, New York. After doing pastoral work in Bavaria from 1960 to 1963 he did missionary work from 1963-1968 for the Berlin Mission in South Africa. He worked first as a district-missionary in the northern Transvaal, then as a lecturer at the Lutheran Theological College, Umpumulo, Natal. He is at present assistant at the Missiological Department of the University in Munich as a candidate for a doctorate.

He is married and has a young family.

Mr. Häselbarth held a permanent residence permit and hoped to apply for South African citizenship. However his residence permit was withdrawn by letter on 21st September, 1968. No reasons were given. Upon application he was then granted an extension until 31st December, 1968. Representations were made to the Department of the Interior by the Church authorities in South Africa. The leader of the Evangelical Church in Germany made representations via the Bonn Government and the S.A. Embassy in Cologne. These negotiations were unsuccessful.

Mr. Häselbarth was actively engaged in the work of the University Christian Movement and its branch at the College at Umpumulo. The University Christian Movement is a movement of Christians at Universities. It is both inter-denominational and inter-racial and draws upon staff, graduates and post-graduates for its membership, witness and service. The Movement has energetically concerned itself to applying its talents, imagination and insight to some of the pressing social problems in South Africa and its members endeavour to do so as Christians and because they are Christians. Though no reasons were given for the withdrawal of his permit, his work with the Uni-

versity Christian Movement may well have precipitated the withdrawal. Or was it what he wrote; for example, the address to the Lutheran Church leaders in April 1968 at Rustenburg or his articles in the ecumenical, inter-racial monthly journal, *Pro Veritate*?

Who knows?

CONCLUSIONS

(i) No reasons have been given for the arbitrary action taken against any of the persons mentioned. We are disturbed by this trend for various reasons. First we hold to the principle of law. We believe that a man (any man and every man) is innocent until proven guilty in a court of law.

However this does not pertain in this regard and it would seem that this is yet another example of how the rule of law has been eroded in South Africa. The Department of Foreign Affairs in its publication "South Africa and the Rule of Law" states that "there is general agreement that (the rule of law) requires that a person on trial be accused in open court; be given an opportunity of denying the charge and of defending himself and that he be given the choice of a counsel". Surely the rule of law requires, in addition, that a person know the precise nature of the charges made against him and the right that he has to go to court.

But here, as elsewhere, powers are delegated by Parliament to the Minister and this power is exercised by his Department with, in some cases, no recourse to the courts of law. This is not even a supremacy of Parliament but supremacy of Ministerial decision; not rule of law but rule of personal, arbitrary decision with authority resting in the discretion of the Minister and those to whom he delegates this power.

(ii) The action under discussion in this article is discriminatory. It is similar in character to bannings and deportation without trial. We deplore this undemocratic trend, claiming that an individual should not be acted arbitrarily against, but be given the reasons for action and offered the opportunity of proving his innocence.

We live in a country allegedly Christian and democratic. Such action is neither Christian nor democratic. What is the underlying mentality that makes this possible? Perhaps we fear the Christ of the Gospel and prefer the one we have made. Doubtless we fear the future and prefer the past. Maybe we are not so

Christian. Clearly we are not democratic.

(iii) Further, as no reasons are normally given to the churches, such action reflects adversely on the churches concerned, even on the Christian body as a whole. Such action is tantamount to saying that the churches are harbouring undesirables within their ranks and calls the integrity of the churches into account. We do not wish the Church to be called in once the Department has reached its decision, as in the case of Fr. van der Hart. Here co-operation would have had the character of connivance. We rather request dialogue between the Department, the Church and the person concerned while his activities are being investigated.

(iv) At the same time we believe that the time has come for churches to clarify where they stand. Most of the established churches have issued statements concerning the relation of the Gospel to the socio-political scene. It is now for them to spell out in practical detail the implications of their statements and to indicate the framework within which their clergy and laity may operate and still enjoy the active support and defence of the leadership.

(v) We do not believe these actions can be interpreted in any way as persecution of the Church. Rather it is action taken against individuals in the churches. Yet the action has a social dimension. Those affected all represent the churches that draw heavily on foreign-born religious workers.

The effects of this are at least twofold. First the overseas churches will be more and more reluctant to train people for South Africa. They will then become estranged from the local Church. This alienation will result in ever increasing isolation.

Secondly the ministers will become reluctant to be vocal and active and the leadership of these churches may be similarly reluctant for fear of reprisals on foreign-born personnel.

One wonders in both regards why the churches who are not affected such as the Reformed Churches, do not voice their concern. For though they are not in a threatened position, surely they are concerned. Surely the allegiance between Church and State is not stronger than the call of the Reformed Ecumenical Synod of Lutheran. For that Synod resolved last year that "in the proclamation of the

Word, the church, to whom has been entrusted the message of Christ's Kingdom, should speak courageously and relevantly on the issues of the day, both for the edification and correction of her members and, when necessary, in criticism of the activities and policies of governments and organisations".

(vi) Without this protest, a subtle control can be and is being exercised on the life and witness of the Church. This force can affect the Church's work and the manner in which it teaches and spreads the Gospel of Christ. However the Church must be free (and indeed be freed) to define its own role, its own goals and determine how it will propagate them.

The Church as the grouping of people having faith in Jesus Christ has both internal and external aims which the Church itself has the right to define. Having faith in Christ (internal aim) means also accepting His mandate to go forth and teach all nations. This external aim implies a reference to the world. The external aims of the Church in reference to the world are threefold:

- to announce salvation in Jesus Christ,
- to invite all men having faith in Christ to an assembly of the people of God i.e. to a Church, and
- to act in the world in terms of the Gospel.

It is precisely in respect of this last external aim viz. the externalization of the Gospel in action which is the incarnational aspect of the Gospel that there is dispute. The Gospel has implications for social, economic and political life. To be a Christian requires fidelity to the teachings of Christ in these areas. The Church in interpreting the Gospel must be free to spell out these implications and call her members to fidelity in these spheres.

(vii) Finally we record that all the ordained clergy described in this article were totally committed to South Africa. As a pledge of this, all of them either at one time applied for or intended to apply for permanent residence and citizenship.

We believe that all foreign-born clergy should be treated as immigrants with the right to permanent residence and citizenship in the normal course. According to the new regulations unordained church workers will be admitted on the same basis as prospective Immigrants.

Ordinary immigrants normally ob-

tain permanent residence once recommended by the Department of Immigration and approved by the Department of the Interior. Normally they receive citizenship within five years of residence.

We submit that it reflects strange-

ly on an allegedly Christian country, anxious to encourage immigration, to thus discriminate against ordained church workers and preclude ministers of the Christian Gospel from equal opportunities for citizenship as any other immigrant.

We appeal, therefore, in conclusion that the whole matter of all foreign born religious workers, ordained and unordained, be treated in future by the Department of Immigration as was the case prior to October 1966.

ARE MINISTERS REALLY NECESSARY?

(Press Release — Church Unity Commission, 30th May, 1969)

What are ministers? Are they different from other Christians? What do they do? Are ministers really necessary?

To many people in the pews and parishes it may seem unimportant. Unfortunately ministers are largely responsible for the unhappy division between the Churches! That is why members of the Church Unity Commission, at their latest meeting in Johannesburg, 26th-29th May, devoted much of their time to considering the Church's Ministry. In this they were assisted by three papers on the subject, prepared, circulated and studied beforehand by members for their discussions. Some forty representatives of the six Churches involved, together with Roman Catholic, Lutheran and I.D.A.M.A.S.A. observers, worked in four groups, and wrote reports which will be carefully analyzed and subsequently presented to the whole Commission. In some respects the reports provided deeper understanding on points upon which there is already a large measure of

agreement. In others, they showed real difficulties to which much more serious consideration must be given.

Such a Commission naturally includes members with widely differing interests and qualifications. It became clear in the course of this meeting that some definite division of their labours would improve both the speed and the efficiency of its work. Accordingly it was agreed to work in future in four distinct but associated sections, amongst which the members will be distributed in accordance with their particular interests and aptitudes. A group of theologians, for example, will apply itself exclusively to tackling the theological differences which still divide us; and another group will devote its attention to examining our method of worship, in order that the liturgical riches of each tradition may contribute to the United Church.

The Commission also continues to give more thought to ways in which parishes and local congregations can be encouraged to co-operate actively in a task which can only be accomplished by the proper and active participation of every member of all the Churches which it represents. To this end it has decided to recommend to all the Church courts the formation of Regional Unity Committees, consisting largely of lay men and women in centres throughout the Republic.

The next meeting of the Commission will take place at St. Peter's Seminary, Hammanskraal at the end of January, 1970. Meanwhile it will not be inactive. Its work will continue during the intervening months, both through its General Purposes Committee in Johannesburg, and through the engagement of all its members in preparing and studying material on the wide variety of important subjects, theological, liturgical and practical with which they will then be concerned.

Die Kerk Buite Suid-Afrika

Prof. B. B. KEET

DIE EKUMENE: JAARVERSLAG VAN DIE WÊRELDBOND VAN GEREFORMEERDE KERKE (Presbyterian World Alliance)

Aan „Inter Nos” het ek die volgende verslag te danke, wat nogal 'n merkwaardige vooruitgang in die werksaamhede van hierdie wêreldliggaam teken, 'n liggaam waaraan ook ons Nederduitse Gereformeerde Kerk behoort. Ek gee dit byna volledig terug:

Die verslag van die Algemene Sekretaris van die Wêreldbond van Gereformeerde Kerke vir die jaar 1968 het as 'n rondskrywe van Desember 1968 die lidkerke bereik. Daaruit die volgende: Dr. Marcel Pradervand sê dat terwyl hy sy verslag skrywe hy aan die einde van sy 20ste jaar van diens as algemene sekretaris van die Bond gekom het. Toe hy tot algemene sekretaris ver-

kies is, was dit feitlik 'n Angelsaksiese organisasie. Teoreties was die Gereformeerde Kerke van die Vasteland en Europa deel daarvan, maar hulle het nie aktief daaraan deelgeneem nie. Latyns-Amerika, Afrika en Asië was nog daarbuite. Hoe anders het dit intussen geword! Nie alleen het die aantal lidkerke meer as verdubbel nie, maar hulle is tans geografies oor die hele wêreld

versprei. Van die 110 lidkerke is 27 in Afrika, 15 in Latyns-Amerika (met insluiting van die Cariebbese Eilande), 10 in Noord-Amerika, 26 in Asië, 3 in Australasië en 29 in Europa.

Hy begin sy oorsig van die aktiwiteite van 1968 met die opmerking dat die ekumeniese strewe die middelpunt vorm van alles wat onderneem is.

(a) Wêreldbond van Geref. Kerke en die Internasionale Raad van Kongregasionaliste

Soos bekend het die uitvoerende komitee van die Wêreldbond van die Geref. Kerke en die uitvoerende komitee van die Kongregasionaliste

op 13 Julie in Uppsala ontmoet. Daar is bekend gemaak dat die lidkerke van die twee organisasies hul toestemming verleen het tot vereniging van die twee liggame. As alles normaal verloop, sal die „Verenigde Algemene Raad” in Nairobi, Kenia, 20-30 Augustus 1970 vergader. Die leidraad vir die besprekings by die geleentheid sal wees: GOD VERSOEN EN BEVRY. Samewerking tussen hierdie twee liggame word egter nie uitgestel tot dié gebeurtenisse nie maar vind reeds plaas soos bv. blyk uit die feit dat die amptelike orgaan *Reformed and Presbyterian World* tans deur albei liggame gesamentlik uitgegee word.

(b) Lutherse Gereformeerde Verhoudings

Goeie vordering geskied in ons wedersydse verhoudings. Daar vind deesdae 'n gereelde verteenwoordiging plaas by die vergaderings van ons onderskeie uitvoerende komitees. Die resultate van ons ad hoc Studiekomitee is deur albei goedgekeur. Daar is ook ooreengekom om 'n Luthers-Gereformeerde Verenigde Komitee aan te stel om voort te gaan met ons beperkings. Dit sal bestaan uit 8 lede, 4 van elke kant en dit sal voortgaan om te ondersoek wat die praktiese implikasies van 'n teologiese consensus tussen Lutherane en Gereformeerdes sal wees.

(c) Verhoudings tussen Rooms-Katolieke Kerk en Wêreldbond van Gereformeerdes

Na bespreking en oorlegpleging tussen die Uitvoerende Komitee van die Wêreldbond en die *Roomse Sekretariaat vir die Bevordering van Christelike Eenheid* is besluit om 'n eerste tentatiewe byeenkoms te hou. Dit het plaasgevind in Genève van 27 tot 29 September, 1968. Verdere samesprekings is gereël vir die Europese lande in 1969. Dan sal bepaalde teologiese probleme en verskilpunte onder bespreking kom. Diepgaande verskille skei ons van die Rooms-Katolieke Kerk, 'n Aantal praktiese dinge wat al ons kerke en veral ons jong kerke direk raak, vra nog om 'n bevredigende oplossing. Maar die verskille tussen ons is die verskille tussen broeders wat saam aan die kerk van Christus behoort. In 'n wêreld waar ateïsme in teorie of praktyk voortgaan om veld te win, is dit van groot belang dat hulle wat hulself dissipels van Jesus Christus noem, hulle daarop sal toelê om die eenheidsband te versterk.

Daar volg nog ander punte wat

ons hier slegs aanstip: o.a. die Wêreldbond en kerkvereniging, die Wêreldbond en wêreldprobleme, die vraag na 'n beter samelewing waar kritiek sonder meer 'n pad is wat doodloop. As Christene beklemtoon ons dat 'n lewende geloof in God, die Vader van onse Here Jesus Christus die enigste vaste fondament vir 'n beter samelewing is. Sonder hierdie geloof verval ons tot 'n vae mensliedheid wat welmenend maar magteloos is.

Dr. Pradervand eindig sy verslag met verwysing na die finansies van die organisasie wat nie sleg is nie, maar ook nie rooskleurig nie. Hy bedank 'n aantal medewerkers, met name dr. Wilhelm Niesel, voorsitter van die Wêreldbond, wat selfs 'n reis na Japan en Korea onderneem, om met sy teenwoordigheid die lidkerke met raad en daad by te staan.

Dit vra geen Saul onder die profete om te voorspel dat ons Ned. Geref. Kerk nie baie lank meer sal kan uithou in hierdie geselskap nie. Dit was nog altyd sy trots dat hy aan die Presbyteriaanse Alliansie behoort en daarom deel het aan die ekumeniese beweging. En nou na Lunteren sal deelname aan die Gereformeerde Ekumeniese Sinode, ook al moeiliker word. Eindlik staan ons alleen in die wêreld — sal ons dan nog 'n Christelike kerk wees?

DIE STEDELIKE KERK

Ecumenical Press Service gee 'n belangwekkende spesiale verslag van 'n landelike kerk wat stedelike kerk geword het. Dit gaan oor die dorp (nou stad) Abidjan, hoofstad van die Ivoorkus (Ivory Coast). Die dorp het 22,000 inwoners gehad, vandag het sy populاسie tot meer as 500,000 gegroei met die gevolg dat voorsiening vir 125,000 nuwe stukke werk en 80,000 nuwe huise gemaak moet word.

Meer as die helfte van Abidjan se inwoners is onder 17 jaar oud, en slegs die helfte is kinders van die Ivoorkus. Die meeste woon in oorbevolkte woonbuurtes.

Hierdie vinige uitbreiding het aan die regering baie probleme besorg; aan die kerk net so. Vorme van kerklike lewe wat vir 'n dorp geskik was, word onvanpas as die dorp 'n voorstad word. Programma's wat in 'n landelike omgewing gewerk het, maak dit soms onmoontlik vir die kerk om 'n nuwe, kosmopolitaanse gemeenskap te dien.

Vir die Metodiste Kerk kan die probleem eenvoudig gestel word. Hoe

bedien 'n kerk, wat sy wortels in 'n landelike omgewing het, sy duisende dorp-georiënteerde lede, wat in die stad werk kom soek het, maar volkome onvoorbereid is vir die probleme waarmee stadsbewoners te doen kry? In Abidjan is die moelikhede vermenigvuldig, omdat dit 'n hawestad is wat gedurig aangeval is deur die kom en gaan van seevaarders.

Die Protestantse Metodiste Kerk in die Ivoorkus is 45 jaar gelede deur Britse sendelinge gestig, wat voortgewerk het op die arbeid van 'n Liberiese profeet, Harris. Omdat die land destyds 95 persent landelik was, het die kerk 'n samestelling van dorps-gemeentes geword. Toe die kerk gewaar geword het dat die land verandering ondergaan, het hy homself begin afvra hoe hy die nuwe situasie in plekke soos Abidjan die hoof kon bied. En omdat die daarstelling van hawefasiliteite die vermeerdering van handel en nywerheid, met sy bygaande instroming van arbeiders gebring het, was dit vanselfsprekend dat aandag sou gegee word aan die hawe om 'n aanduiding te vind omtrent sy roeping.

In die begin was die Protestantse aandeel baie beskeie. Die plaaslike outoriteite het in 1962 'n terrein aan die kerk ter beskikking gestel. 'n Kapelaan is as sendeling onder die matrose uit fondse van die Wêreldraad aangestel. Kort daarna het die Pan-Afrikaanse Konferensie van Kerke fondse geskenk vir 'n pastorie en 'n vergadersaal. Hierdie kapelaanskap („Fraternité du Port”) is 'n gesamentlike onderneming. Die terrein is geskenk deur die hawe-outoriteite, die fondse is deur die ekumeniese aksie van die Afrikaanse kerke gevind, skenkinge is ontvang van die „Evangelische Arbeitsgemeinschaft für Weltmission” in Hamburg, die Australiese Raad van Kerke en die Nederlandse fonds van „Kom over de Brug”.

Die eerste erediens is op 8 April 1968 gehou. Dieselfde dag is die pastorie in gebruik geneem, wat dien nie slegs as aanbiddingssentrum nie, maar ook as plek van samekoms waar allerlei sake bespreek word en alle soorte van rekreasie gevind word. Dit word gehoop dat die sentrum sy taak sal vervul as 'n plek van samekoms vir werkers in die omgewing sowel as verder weg. Almal word verwelkom: werkgewers sowel as werknemers, jonk en oud, mans en vrouens, matrose wat Abidjan aandoen en permanente inwoners.

VRYSINNIG?

Uit die „Groninger Kerkbode” kom die volgende berig uit die pen van ds. J. R. Hommes voor, wat seker die aandag van Gereformeerdes verdien. Ek haal aan: Die Amerikaanse ds. P. de Jong skryf na aanleiding van die Nederlandse sinodesbesluit insake die leeruitspraak van Assen (1926) dat die Gereformeerde Kerke in Nederland die vrysinnigheid welkom heet. Die Groningse gereformeerde Ds. J. R. Hommes, maak teen hierdie beskuldiging beswaar, en skryf o.a.:

Volgens my mening wemel hierdie beskouing van ds. de Jong van misverstande en onjuiste beweringe. En ek vind dit erg dat hy in hierdie verband die woord vrysinnig gebruik. Helaas is hy nie die enigste nie. Ook onder ons word hierdie woord meermale in dieselfde verband gebruik. Maar volkome sonder reg. Wie die besluit van die sinode insake die Assen leeruitspraak lees, en die besprekinge wat daaraan voorafgaan, gevolg het, al was dit alleen maar uit die dagbladders, kan weet dat dit eenvoudig 'n karikatuur is om te sê dat die sinode die beginsel van die betroubaarheid van Gods Woord insake die feite verlaat het, en dat dit dwaas is om te sê dat die sinode dit aan elke persoon oorlaat om te beslis

wat uit Gods Woord as gesaghebbend aanvaar moet word en wat onjuis mag genoem word.

Dit het uitsluitend daarom gegaan nl. om die *moontlikheid* van 'n ander eksegeese van Gen. 2-3 as die puur-letterlike. Let wel, om 'n ander eksegeese, 'n ander uitlegging. En by hierdie uitlegging is die menslike rede nie gesaghebbend nie, maar die bedoeling van God met elke Skrifgedeelte, waarby Skrif met Skrif vergelyk word. Daarom is dit volkome onjuis om hier van vrysinnigheid te praat. Langs hierdie weg sou miljoene Christene in die wêreld, wat met ons dieselfde God en Heiland bely, vrysinnig genoem kan word. En dit mag nie. Met sulke woorde mag ons tog nie mekaar betry nie. Dat ons nie in alles met mekaar in die kerk saamstem nie, is nie so erg nie. Dit kan nie genoeg herhaal word dat die kerk nie 'n klub enersdenkendes is nie (dan sou ons skeuring op skeuring kry) maar die vergadering van almal wat hul saligheid van Jesus Christus verwag. As ons op dié grond met mekaar spreek, kan daar wel meningsverkille wees, maar dan is 'n eerste vereiste dat ons geen opgeblase of wondende woorde teenoor mekaar gebruik nie, maar mekaar volkome ernstig neem en na mekaar se argumente luister.

TWO IMPORTANT PUBLICATIONS

The two following publications are now obtainable from the Christian Institute of Southern Africa, P.O. Box 31134, Braamfontein, Transvaal:

A. *Crisis*, by the Rev. John Davies, Anglican Chaplain at the University of the Witwatersrand and the Johannesburg College of Education.

—A telling of Saint John's story of the Passion and Resurrection of Christ.

In this 50-page booklet, Father Davies deals in a very telling way with the Passion and Resurrection of Christ in six short chapters:

1. Arrest
2. False and Genuine Security
3. Truth and Subversion
4. The Man and the Nation
5. Finishing the Work
6. Burial and Beyond

This booklet published by the Christian Institute (*Price: 20 cents, including postage*) has a very real message for us in South Africa today. Do order a copy.

B. *Lutherans in South Africa*, by the Rev. Dr. Hans W. Florin, a 180-pages paperback, very limited stock (*Price: R3 per copy, including postage.*)

This book, concerned mainly about Lutheran presence, witness and participation in the ecumenical movement, sets these concerns within the wide social, political and Church scene of South Africa. This book should be read.

Impressions of the W.C.C. consultation on Racism

(LONDON, MAY, 1969)

I. E. THOMPSON

“We pray to our gods for you Christians, that perhaps, in spite of your Christianity, you may yet become human” — said one of the non-Christian delegates at the W.C.C. Consultation on Racism. This remark was made with the utmost sincerity and compassion and because it was not an expression of inverted racism nor meant at all patronisingly, it served to focus the whole question of the Church in the racial crisis of the 20th century. What became painfully obvious in the course of the consultation was the relativity and inadequacy of our Euro-centric Christianity. The world is asking for, even demanding, a humanism that is more embracing and universal than that of either the White dominated Christian Churches, or that of the Euro-centric Communist ideology. The question is: can either Christianity or Communism transcend the parochialism of their cultural origins and achieve the true universality which they purport to represent?

BULWARKS OF WHITE RACISM

The W.C.C. and its member churches were attacked from every quarter for being the main bulwarks of institutionalised white racism.

This criticism would have been easily dismissed if it were not pointed out in painful detail at every level. For example: the sincerity of the British Council of Churches was called in question when it was pointed out that the Church of England and the

Church of Scotland profited last year to the tune of R30,000,000 from its investments in South Africa and Rhodesia. The incident when the Archbishop of Canterbury ‘slapped down’ a Black Power speaker in the course of one of the plenary sessions was revealing too in a most decisive way.

The Russian delegates and the other delegates from the Communist Bloc were given a real drubbing by non-white speakers from all over the world. The bitterness with which the white racist character of Soviet policy was pointed out was a measure of the disappointment felt in the non-white world at the failure of Communism to offer a more viable and universal humanism than Christianity had done.

One of the speakers said rather sharply: "You white europeans, obsessed as you are with your own importance, can't see further than the domestic quarrels of Europe: between Catholics and Protestants, Communists and Capitalists—whereas the division between you and us is far deeper and wider and more dangerous".

'WHITE' REACTIONS

One's reaction to African, American, Asian, Latin American non-white Christians was quite simply — why have these men who seek to turn the world upside-down come here also? These men who call black, white and white, black; who call impure and corrupt what we call pure and holy and who call innocent and good what we regard as diabolical and evil; who speak of violence as the road to peace, and our present peace as a living death; who sing of the vitality and beauty being black and lament the cadaverous coldness of the dying white world. Out of their strength and flaming life they reach out with generous warmth, compassion and humour to embrace their anaemic and paralysed white brothers, conscious that theirs, not ours, is the responsibility of building a new and better world. Do we have to be purified by black fire? One's reaction as a white man is — go away and let me die in peace. I don't want to be turned about or have my world turned upside down. I don't want to join in the dance of Siva. Who is the Lord of the Dance?

Where are our points of reference? In the Bible? In the Church? "Behold the very foundations of the temple do shake at the voice of Him who spoke" (Isa. 6). How does one get one's bearings now? You can't! What are the initiatives open to the Church? There are none which are really *your* initiatives! What can I do? Wait in silence and see the glory that will be revealed when the Son of man reveals the beauty and the awe-fulness of his new humanity to the sons of men!

We white Christians can't get out of our delusions of grandeur, we still want to call all the moves, we still want to be heroes and martyrs and prophets. Can we learn to be disciples again, to be obedient to the Word when it is not spoken by one of our own appointed prophets? Can we learn what apostleship means

under obedience, in listening to the Word of God in the mouth of the Son of man rather than preaching the word of man as self-appointed sons of God? Can we hear the Word from the mouths of Black Prophets, and obey it? If we do, we may perhaps know what Bonhoeffer prophesied — "the day will come when men will be called again to utter the Word of God with such power as will change and renew the world. It will be a new language, which will horrify men and overwhelm them by its power. It will be the language of a new righteousness and truth, a language which proclaims the peace of God with men and the advent of his kingdom. "And (they) shall fear and tremble for all the good and for all the peace that I procure unto it" Jeremiah 33:9"—(*Letters and Papers from Prison — Reflections on his nephew's baptism*).

THEOLOGY OF THE POWERLESS

Several white delegates spoke of the role of the Church to be Victim — especially the White Church — to discover through the paradox of its powerlessness the power of Christ at work on his world. The consultation returned again and again to this theme — that ours has been a theology of the powerful which, addressed to the powerless, is emasculating and inhuman in its effect on both bosses and bossed. The demand is for a theology of the powerless (for Christ emptied Himself and became powerless that He might raise us up with Him). This theology might be of more significance to Blacks today, but tomorrow the white minority of the world will have to discover its meaning for them. This will perhaps involve the recognition that what are dirty words in today's theology: terms like 'revolution', 'violence', 'reparations', 'separation', 'retribution' are perhaps the only terms capable of expressing the reality of the Christian Mission in the modern world. A complete reversal of perspective is necessary if we are to see the challenge Christ is presenting to the churches in the modern world — the challenge to come out of our ghettos and prepare for the New Pentecost of a world united by his Spirit.

It is against this background of profound theological concern that it is necessary to see and evaluate all

the radical talk about reparations or retribution or redress of injustices, about violence and revolution, of the necessity for the churches to support the movement for Black Power, of practical commitment of personnel and resources to the cause of a real and lasting world peace.

Reference was made to the "teutonic domination of the whole theological enterprise". This expressed not only the widespread disgust with the Euro-centric parochialism of Christianity, but also a deep awareness of a new Babel situation in which the churches are involved. "What are the real motives for the so-called 'ecumenical movement'? Aren't you just ganging up together against us of the 'Third World'?"

DEFINITIONS

In one of the most brilliant and incisive papers read at the consultation an American sociologist spoke of definition (whether in science, sociology, politics, philosophy or theology) as a "technique of manipulation", as the chief tool of the European "rational" man's will-to-power. He urged that we should be aware of the danger of trying to define things rather than to suffer situations, but needless to say the English speaking delegates of all races fell into the trap of trying to define terms like 'racial identity', 'human', 'culture'. One day's deliberations were wasted in the futile debate about definitions. Perhaps it was necessary that this should happen before people could realise that although everyone spoke the same language, they didn't understand one another — for the different conventions, values and metaphysical assumptions underlying the use of the English language in different cultures had to become painfully apparent before people could look at one another and say 'I hear and don't understand'. We were busy in a common enterprise — "building a tower whose top might reach unto heaven, that we might make us a name", and we found ourselves confused and unable to co-operate. Only through a willingness to confess our failure and start again without preconceptions — even theological preconceptions — made it possible to face the situation and pray together for the New Fire of Pentecost which would create a new community and a new language out of the ruins of our ecclesiastical Tower of Babel.

A Radio Generation

The Rev. L. MABASO

The impact of radio, film, television, other audio-visual aids and literature can justly boast of having created a new generation. Wherever we go — in cars, planes, trains or on foot, we meet people with newspapers, books, transistor radios, tape-recorders or cameras. Thousands more than those we meet, gather around their radios, TV sets or tape-recorders to listen, observe or entertain themselves with news and programmes offered through these media.

That these media have created a self-made public is attested to by the styles, music and slants reflected by people in their public life. The once unquestionable fact that these media belong to the "haves" is no longer true. It is becoming less true in Africa as well. People are beginning to look upon having these media as part of their existence.

PROJECTION OF SELF-IMAGE

The sharing of world news through radio and television has created a tremendous unity among mankind. Mass communications represent an ingenious device for vastly enlarged human communications and a widening scope for individual choice. This contributes to man's freedom. Man is now free to choose from a wider range of choices.

Emile Durkheim defined idols as "representations of the collective". He meant that they were symbols of a tribe, a clan or a nation projected into the heavens and given the status of divine beings. Karl Marx taught that all values were merely a projection of the economic power-interest of a class. Christianity and Communism as we may see, despite their differences, played nearly identical rôles in the removal of traditional religious restraints in favour of scientific and technological change. These were disenchantments with nature and vital components of secularization. Following upon these thoughts, it is no exaggeration to say that modern mass communications have created a society which projects its own self-image and organises the values and meanings by which man lives in a most secular use of the word self-image.

POWER OF MASS MEDIA

The most deadly challenge of mass media is its potential power when used with a secular sway. Perverse images of reality in, say, news reports, create a misinformed world. Billions of people can be told something untrue through mass media

and believe it as true. Or they can read or see for themselves what happened at Limehill, yet mass media can tell them that the situation is not so serious as some have exaggerated it to be.

Or a whole nation can suffer under oppression from another, yet broadcasts might announce that everything is peaceful and prosperous.

These are facts which contribute to the creation of a misinformed mass-media generation. A generation which goes about in song and music without any idea of the serious happenings in the world. And this because their eyes and ears live in the world of the ones controlling what passes through mass media.

In Africa we are victims of socio-economic and political ideologies. Broadcasts in various African languages make various reports accessible to all. Yet, by the same means, news can be suppressed or given a slant by a certain group or community. Consequently mass media which are necessary and good for a wider outreach can be a means of limiting that outreach. Thus modern man becomes the victim of modern mass communication.

If man is to free himself from this power of the mass media, he has to be mentally and audio-visually enlightened so that he can decide objectively about what he sees and hears through mass media.

EDUCATION

The Church has a duty to provide such an education. It should deepen man's understanding and power to decide for himself. This is what Christ did, in effect, when He healed, taught and opened the eyes of the blind and the ears of the deaf. However the disappointing fact about this aspect of mission is that many church leaders are not even sincerely convinced about the use of mass media as means of communicating the Gospel. They base their arguments on the expense

both for the Church as an organisation and for the people as the would-be audience to buy and own these media. Their whole argument can be summed up in the fact that the media are impersonal. Yet mass media are not meant to replace personal evangelization, but to supplement it.

Few could deny the high cost of mass media. This is partly the reason for the closing down of L.P. Studios (sponsored by the Lutheran World Federation) in Roodepoort, Transvaal last year.

Evangelization through mass media must be carried out through cooperation with other christian denominations of the same locality. Such a participation on the lower level is basic. On the higher it should embrace a world-wide christian fellowship. The project should not be imposed from higher level, but should rather grow from local government.

To initiate this or other projects in communities where they have previously been unknown, the best method seems to be to seek advice and carry out some research work among the indigenous people to discover the necessity, possible reaction and participation of local peoples if the projects were implemented. Otherwise, mass media sponsored from foreign bodies remain foreign, both because their finance, personnel and administration are foreign.

PARTICIPATION

The missionary idea of incorporating indigenous personnel into the administration of such projects is frustrating. One wonders whether it is an attempt to invite participation of indigenous people or really aims at giving to the sponsoring bodies abroad the impression that indigenous personnel are happy with what is being done. But the betrayal becomes crystal clear when it comes to discussions relating either to finance or whether a project should be discontinued. Here the missionary has the final word because he foots the bill. The African leadership then becomes not so African after all. Its more-than-nominal, yet ghostlike leadership, is thus bypassed in decisive matters.

Those who have something to sell pay heavily for advertisements without reckoning on returns. They believe that there will be returns for their expenses. They operate on this belief. Advertisements of religious services or meetings are still largely absent from our mass media. The simple reason for this is that many of us consider it too secular to advertise Church programmes. Where it is done, it can often be detected that it is done rather for subjective reasons than objective ones. It is surprising why religious leaders feel

that secular means cannot, or must not, be exploited for religious ones.

In Old Hebrew communities, people stood on house-tops and on mountains when announcing something for public attention. They were using the best means for outreach available to them. Secular means, to be sure, Christ referred to such announcements from the house tops in the New Testament. And besides taught on the mountains or by the sea himself. He was crucified on a mountain top, where all could see him. Whatever other reasons could

be given for all this, there is no doubt that they provided through secular means a platform whereby the largest possible public could be reached.

The Church of Christ in Africa needs zealous personnel to broadcast, write about and otherwise communicate God's will. They in turn need to be supported no matter what the cost. In this service we seriously lag behind those who spare no expense for their propaganda and exploitation of other people.

LETTERS / BRIEWE

CONTINUATION OF APARTHEID DISASTROUS FOR OUR SOULS

Mr. P. M. Harker, "King's Lynn",
Boye's Drive, Muizenberg, Cape.

Would it be permissible to challenge Mr. V. G. Davies' political beliefs on religious grounds, seeing that his opinions which are so frequently expressed in secular publications, which quite understandably do not exchange religious controversy, have been expressed in a Christian journal — your April issue? My own political beliefs are so far removed from those of Mr. Davies that it might stimulate some thought, and perhaps dialogue.

You head up Mr. Davies' letter *Abolition of Apartheid could be disastrous*. I wish to pose 3 or 4 questions which might suggest that the *continuation of apartheid*, "albeit in a modified and morally more acceptable form", could be *disastrous* for our souls, if not for our bodies.

(1) Mr. Davies starts — "In common with the vast majority of the Whites . . .". Does this very fact of an overwhelming majority, in a cause which is so very convenient for the comfort and well-being of Whites only, not lead to caution, suspicion even, that it really is too good, and too easy, to be true? The fact also that this majority includes all those who quite blatantly favour *baasskap*, or the preservation of *privilege for all time*? All those, too, who do not profess religious or moral influences in the formulation of their philosophies?

The faithful, in the Biblical sense, have always been a minority, a remnant, in both Christian and pre-Christian era.

Assuming that we are trying to be faithful, in this as in other issues praying — 'Not our will, but thine be done' — how do we reconcile the remnant with this "vast majority", a very mixed bag? We don't surely, claim infallibility for the South African Whites, do we? Sometimes one wonders, because the rest of the world, both white and non-white, is so very out of step!

(2) "The abolition of apartheid . . . would certainly bring about a *levelling* down of our society, and this is a sacrifice which the whites will not, and should not, make."

This is the right time of year to meditate on sacrifices. Is our capacity to enter into the joy of Easter not in direct proportion to our willingness to identify ourselves with the sacrifice of Good Friday? How, then can a Christian draw a line and say — 'This sacrifice I will not, nay should not, make'? This was the error Judas made, hoping to avoid Jesus' obvious determination to offer himself for sacrifice. After all, that is no more practical politics in 1969 than it was in 1935 and years ago, is it?

Fortunately for us, Jesus did not claim exception for himself. He was "levelled down" to our mortal condition, or else the incarnation has no meaning at all for us.

And, as a man, Jesus did not identify himself with Sea Point, Bishops-court and Constantia, and invite the poorer suburbs to come up and join him. Rather he "levelled down" to

the shacks of the Cape Flats, and invited the fastidious to do likewise.

Surely the point of the Good Samaritan parable is that the Priest and the Levite would not allow themselves to be levelled down where, and only where, they could help, and so fulfil the one and only purpose of their lives?

(3) "In the present circumstances we have no choice but to continue with apartheid . . . if we are to maintain peace and progress in the country".

Are we not told to seek the things that are above, which belong to our peace? Surely that does not mean the type of peace which has to be police enforced? And the only progress we can claim for South Africa is material progress, mainly of the whites. Can *this* be our goal, which justifies apartheid? Is it not rather too similar to "Mammon" which, so very like apartheid, prevents us serving God?

(4) "The whites have a *moral duty* to work for the *levelling* up of our heterogeneous society." Frankly I can't see any morality at all in this target. Did Christ make any attempts to level people up, or down, or did he simply try to make them WHOLE PEOPLE? The level is immaterial, surely?

What I would also like Mr. Davies to think about is what precedent there is in history, in any society, at any stage of development, of a privileged minority having *levelled up* the masses to their own standards, whether of wealth, education or culture. Has it ever happened? Is this another aspect of the wishful thinking which is apartheid? Or is this

yet another instance of our claim to be unique?

In "Black Woman in Search of God", Mia Brandel-Syrrier wrote this: "How naive to think that one can abolish crime by raising income and clearing slums; you merely get another kind of crime." And that statement holds good for the South African white just as much as for any other people.

Let there be no misunderstanding. The incarnation was the supreme act of enforced integration. The privileged liked it so little, they brought it to an end — or so they thought.

DIFFICULT TO UNDERSTAND

Mr. P. A. Faithfull, Bible Institute of South Africa, Main Road, Kalk Bay, Cape.

For whom is *Pro Veritate* intended? It is a technical theological magazine for theologians, or it is for ordinary Christians?

As a Christian who has been blessed with an education that many would like to have at University, I had hoped that I would be able quickly to grasp the issues being discussed, especially as many of them appear in the daily newspapers.

I am distressed to find, however, that it is really difficult, if not beyond me, to understand what some of your contributors are getting at. As examples I would mention "Can we not walk together?" by Douglas Bax and "Apologia pro vita nostra" by Mark Collier in the issue of 15th April.

Accepting that the Apologia is an essay in philosophy, or a "philosophico-scientific way of looking" at the Christian faith, in contrast to the same author's application of principles to a test-case in the same issue, the article by the Rev. Bax appears to be a defence of the Message to the People of South Africa.

Having read the Message and the reply to it by the Baptist Union, I have become interested in the doctrinal issues involved. Not only is the Rev. Bax's article beyond my poor mind, but I find that the Message is

far less clear than a quick reading of it would suggest. The "interpretations" and "misunderstandings" that are apparently so inexcusable in the Baptist Statement must please be forgiven in an ordinary Christian not familiar with the peculiar language of modern theology.

To begin to tackle this thorn-bush: Do the authors of the Message believe in the salvation of all human beings whether they accept Jesus Christ or not? What do the authors mean by "salvation"? What do they mean by "Gospel"? Are these words used with more than one meaning to the same word? How would they define "Ideology"?

WAAROM GOEIE WERKE

Mnr. A. J. J. Burger, Marie, Pk. Witvlei.

Aangesien daar ook baie lede van Protestantse kerke is wat van die standpunt uitgaan dat goeie werke onontbeerlik en noodsaaklik is as 'n bydrae tot hul saligheid, wil ek graag een en ander daaroor sê.

Vraag 86 van die Heidelbergse Kategismus lui: „Aangesien ons uit ons ellende, sonder enige verdienste van ons kant, alleen uit genade, deur Christus verlos is, waarom moet ons dan nog goeie werke doen?”

Die antwoord lui: „Omdat Christus, nadat Hy ons met sy bloed gekoop en vrygemaak het, ons ook deur sy Heilige Gees tot sy ewebeeld vernuwe, sodat ons met ons hele lewe aan God dankbaarheid vir sy weldade sal bewys en Hy deur ons geprys word. Dan ook, dat elkeen by homself van sy geloof uit die vrugte versekerd kan wees en dat deur ons godsalige wandel ons naaste ook vir Christus gewin kan word.”

Dan is daar 'n hele reeks verwysing na Bybeltekste wat hierdie waarheid bevestig. Ek haal dit nie aan nie, omdat almal dit in die Heidelbergse Kategismus kan nalees, maar herinner slegs aan die woorde van Johannes die Doper by die geleentheid toe ook die Fariseërs hulle laat doop het: „Dra dan vrugte wat by die bekering pas”.

Goeie werke het dus geen waarde vir onbekeerdes nie en kan en sal ook nie hulle saligheid bewerk nie. Daar is mense wat roem dat hulle dag en datum van hulle bekering onthou, maar hulle lewe loënstraf hulle belydenis.

Wat egter bedroewend is, is dat so baie Christene ook nog van die standpunt uitgaan dat hulle goeie werke 'n noodsaaklike bydrae is om hulle redding te verseker en dat Christus hulle by gebreke daarvan sal wegwys, terwyl die „Gees saam met ons gees getuig dat ons kinders van God is”. Wanneer ons gelei word deur die Heilige Gees en ons ook laat lei, is die werke wat gebore word uit liefde en geloof ons troos.

Die neiging onder Protestantse Christene om nog die leer van die goeie werke voorop te stel, skyn my 'n Roomse suurdeeg te wees wat nog onder ons aanwesig is.

Daar is 'n ander en groter gevaar, en dit is dat baie bekeerlinge volwyer is wanneer hulle besluit of gelei word om die Here Jesus te volg, en van die gedagte uitgaan dat sonde nou nie meer in hulle lewe kan voorkom nie. En as hulle dan vind, soos die brief aan die Romeine dit stel, dat in hulle, d.w.s. hulle vlees, niks goeds woon nie, gooi hulle baie maal tou op.

Die elfde gesang bring so 'n diep Skriftuurlike waarheid aan ons tuis, wat vir ons ook tot troos is en ons 'n kykie gee in die sielondervinding van die digter. Hoe kan ons God ooit na waarde dank vir sondeberou en die seën wat volg op die eerlike belydenis van sonde, en 'n waaragtige begeerte om volgens al die gebooie van God te lewe!

Jesus sê aan sy dissipels in Joh. 15:10: „As julle my gebooie bewaar, sal julle in my liefde bly”. Nou weet ons uit ondervinding dat geen offering te groot is vir diegene wat ons liefhet nie. Dit behoort dus vir almal duidelik te wees dat goeie werke wat waarde in die oog van God het, die is wat gebore word uit liefde en dankbaarheid teenoor God vir die onverdiende en wonderlike verlossing wat Hy vir ons bewerk het. Die geloof lei tot goeie werke, en nie andersom nie. Deur sy genade word ons sonder verdienste geregtig deur die verlossing wat in Christus Jesus is (Rom. 3:24).