



PRO VERITATE

BRUCKNER DE VILLIERS

The crisis

J. P. FEDDEMA

Die beleid van Bantoe-tuislande

E. A. DU PLESSIS

"We preach not ourselves..."

„VERANTWOORDE REVOLUTIE"

MARIE-LOUISE MARTIN

Questions put to the Churches

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

Volume VII No. XI | Jaargang VII Nr. XI MARCH 15 MAART 1969

PRO VERITATE

CHRISTIAN MONTHLY FOR SOUTHERN AFRICA
CHRISTELIKE MAANDBLAD VIR SUIDELIKE AFRIKA

EDITORIAL

EDITOR:

Dr. B. Engelbrecht.

EDITORIAL COMMITTEE:

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

ADMINISTRATION/ CORRESPONDENCE

CIRCULATION MANAGER:

Dr. W. B. de Villiers.

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

SUBSCRIPTION

Subscription payable in advance.

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

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

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

PLEASE NOTE

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

PRO VERITATE appears on the 15th of every month.

(Price per single copy 10c).

IN THIS ISSUE...

- The crisis in which Christians in Southern Africa find themselves in a time of racial tension, says Dr. Bruckner de Villiers, is essentially the crisis of all times, namely, that of the struggle of God in reconciling man to Himself and to his neighbour. P. 4
- Is the Bantustan policy of the South African government a myth, or fiction, or is it an honest and realistic solution to South Africa's racial problem? Drs. J. P. Feddema discusses this question. P. 7
- Mr. E. A. du Plessis meditates on the meaning and implications of St. Paul's words, "We preach not ourselves, but Christ Jesus as Lord . . ." for South African Christians with regard to their calling and witness in the situation caused by the policy of apartheid. P. 9
- Ben Engelbrecht reviews a recently published book by Prof. H. G. Schulte Nordholt and Prof. J. Verkuyl on "responsible revolution" and indicates its relevance for South African Christians. P. 11
- Christ is present in the events of our time, working out both judgment and salvation, says Dr. Marie-Louise Martin and asks whether the churches are able to see and interpret the "signs". P. 14
- Prof. B. B. Keet writes in his column "The Church outside South Africa" inter alia about ways in which the memory of the late Dr. Martin Luther King is honoured in various countries. P. 16

IN HIERDIE UITGAWE

- Die krisis waarin Christene in Suider-Afrika hulle bevind in 'n tyd van rasse-spanninge, sê dr. Bruckner de Villiers, is wesenlik die krisis van alle tye, nl. dié van die worsteling van God om die mens met Homself en met sy naaste te versoen. Bl. 4
- Is die beleid van Bantoe-tuislande 'n mite, 'n fiksie, of 'n eerlike, reële oplossing van Suid-Afrika se rasse-probleem? Drs. J. P. Feddema bespreek hierdie probleem. Bl. 7
- Mnr. E. A. du Plessis mediteer oor die betekenis en implikasies van Paulus se woorde: „Ons verkondig nie onself nie, maar Christus Jesus as Here . . .” vir Suid-Afrikaanse Christene met betrekking tot hulle roeping en getuenis in die situasie wat deur die apartheidsbeleid veroorsaak is. Bl. 9
- Ben Engelbrecht bespreek 'n boek wat onlangs verskyn het uit die pen van prof. H. G. Schulte Nordholt en prof. J. Verkuyl oor „verantwoorde revolusie” en toon aan wat dit vir Christene in Suid-Afrika beteken. Bl. 11
- Christus is teenwoordig in die gebeurtenisse van ons tyd, besig om oordeel sowel as verlossing uit te werk, sê dr. Marie-Louise Martin. Is die kerke in staat om die „tekens” te sien en te verklaar? Bl. 14
- Prof. B. B. Keet skryf in sy rubriek „Die Kerk buite Suid-Afrika” o.m. oor die wyse waarop die nagedagtenis van wyls dr. Martin Luther King in verskeie lande in ere gehou word. Bl. 16

Editorial:

THE QUESTION OF THE "ALTERNATIVE"

The Christian witness against apartheid is currently being challenged from circles believing in this ideology to say what, then, the alternative to apartheid is. What is apparently meant thereby is that a clearly defined and fully elaborated programme should be submitted as alternative for the political course which is being followed in our country at present.

We would like to make a few remarks in this connection. The first is this, that one would like to interpret it as a sign of hope (even though it only be a "cloud as big as a man's hand") that the suspicion is at least starting to emerge somewhere among some of the adherents of the ideology that such a thing as an indubitably **Christian** witness against apartheid can exist. It would indeed be an event in South Africa as it has become during the past 21 years if the realisation were finally to break through that all criticism of the current politics of the country need not necessarily have as its "pernicious" origin the doctrines of "communism" and "liberalism". One does not want to rejoice prematurely, but let us at least hope that the recognition will also dawn in due course that apartheid is not the highest norm for what ought to be believed and for what is good and right, but that the norms of the Word of God must be applied also to the faith in apartheid and its practices. And let us hope furthermore that here and there the idea may start taking shape that there could just be the possibility of an alternative and that apartheid is not such an absolute way of salvation as is so loudly proclaimed from political and ecclesiastical pulpits.

It is, in fact, but a faint hope, but we wish to cling to it like a straw. There will be but one salvation for South Africa from the vortex of its fatal bewitchment with apartheid: if the willingness again becomes evident to listen to God's Word.

In the meantime — this is our second remark — it should not engender in us an all too great optimism. The tiny gleam of hope suddenly becomes obscured again by the fact that the challenge is uttered so challengingly. For the time being, it is still unmistakably clear that it comes from a self-assured stance upon a presumed absolute unassailability of the ideology of apartheid. For the present, there are no signs yet of a preparedness to listen really seriously and to consider arguments. Far rather does one gain the unedifying impression that "proofs" are sought. From the very criticism brought to bear on it the absoluteness of apartheid as unique way of salvation for South Africa must emerge as proven so much more indubitably. And, probably because apartheid poses as such a clearly defined ideology — in any case it brings its influence to bear on all levels of society with an unbending and merciless consistency — its critics are importuned to come to the fore with an equally clearly defined alternative: thus to prove that it would amount to nothing more than a policy of integration which, just like apartheid, would bring its influence to bear on all levels of society with

an unbending and merciless consistency. If it could only be proved in this manner that this was, at root, the ultimate concern of all Christian witness against apartheid, those persons and bodies who appeal to the Word of God, and the truths of Christian faith in their condemnation of the ideology could comfortably be unmasked, identified and placed.

Christian bodies who are radically condemning the current political trend in South Africa would certainly be wise also if they were to bear in mind that it is the task of political parties to devise political programmes; that, on the level of the contest between the parties, there are (and were) in fact political parties with alternative programmes who stand (and stood) in radical opposition to the politics of apartheid; and that they have been compelled by legislation either to cease to exist or not to practice in fact what is believed in principle. The "mixed" membership of such Christian bodies makes it extremely hazardous for them to venture too far on to the field of practical politics, precisely because they so radically condemn the politics of our day and cannot allow their own internal organisation to conform to it for reasons of faith.

There can indeed be no doubt that the ideology of apartheid would be unambiguously condemned precisely on the basis of Christian faith. And however many infringements there may have been of the rights of men who have made this condemnation audible on the level of Christian faith, the freedom still exists in South Africa to confess and experience the opposite of apartheid on this level. Christian organisations will therefore have to think twice before they start spelling out obvious "alternatives" to apartheid and its practices of injustice in such a way that it can be regarded as a political programme. The invitation to do so may prove to be a dangerous siren's song.

But then, a third remark:

This does not mean, and dare also not be interpreted thus, that Christian organisations should either deliberately remain silent for the sake of their own safety and advancement or that they should shamefacedly confess their inability to indicate the clear and clearly-defined alternative. For what is, at the moment, the most essential task of Christian witness is to keep on saying unceasingly that it is a false statement of the problem to speak of an "alternative" to apartheid if what is meant is an alternative spiritual foundation for the arrangement of the multi-racial South African society. Apartheid, as it is professed and applied in South Africa is, after all, the rejection of every conception of community life, solidified in an ideology. It is the most radical denial imaginable, both of the fact that there should be community in South Africa, and of the necessity that a spiritual basis has to be found for the ordering of this community. It is the ideology of capitulation before the demand and of evasion of the task of recognising in South Africa the factually existing multi-racial society which should

be ordered into a community. Therefore it can never be the spiritual foundation of an **ordered** society. It is the ideology of the perpetuation of chaos.

For this reason millions of non-white South Africans are, viewed from the standpoint of apartheid, a political and social "problem" here in their only, God-given mother country. A more thorough creation of political chaos is hardly imaginable than in a country where the authorities are saddled with millions of children of the land, useful citizens whom they do not know what to do with. Our political leaders and protagonists of apartheid, and specifically the Prime Minister, simply do not know what the future of the Coloureds ought to be here in their own country (and the most lunatic phenomenon of all is that they are praised for such an open admission!); they also do not know what the future of the Africans in the "white" and urban areas should be; and they truly do not know how dark the future is here for the whites on account of the politics they practice.

It is a complete misunderstanding, therefore, to speak of an "alternative" to apartheid. All that must be insisted upon is a swift and extremely urgent

corrective. And this corrective is so obvious that it can, from the very nature of things, only be described in the clearest language — too clearly for it to be subject to any misunderstanding. The corrective for the idea of apartheid, i.e. of this radical negation of the fundamental truth that South Africa is, once and for all, a country in which a variety of races live and **have** to live together, is the sober and realistic acceptance of this fact. This is where we shall have to start: with the realisation that there **can** be no apartheid in South Africa except as an inevitably fatal programme for the production of chaos.

Only when we return from our ideological delusion to simple and undeniable reality, and make this elementary admission that South Africa as a whole is no less the only mother country of the Coloured and the African than it is of the Whites, can we meaningfully start asking the question concerning the spiritual foundation upon which this society must be based and ordered. And Christian witness has a fundamental contribution to offer in this regard from the riches of knowledge and insight of divine revelation with which it is equipped.

Redaksioneel:

DIE „ALTERNATIEF" - KWESSIE

Aan die Christelike getuienis teen apartheid word tans vanuit kringe wat dié ideologie glo, die uitdaging gerig om te sê wat dan die alternatief vir apartheid is. Daarmee word blykbaar bedoel dat 'n duidelik-omlynde en volledig uitgewerkte program voorgelê moet word as alternatief vir die politieke koers wat tans in ons land gevolg word.

Ons wil graag hieroor enkele opmerkings maak. Die eerste is dit, dat 'n mens dit graag as 'n teken van hoop wil vertolk (al is dit nog maar 'n „wolkie soos 'n man se hand") dat die vermoede ten minste êrens onder sekere aanhangers van die ideologie begin posvat dat daar ook 'n onbetwyfelbare **Christelike** getuienis teen apartheid kan wees. Dit sal voorwaar 'n gebeurtenis in Suid-Afrika wees soos wat hy gedurende die afgelope 21 jaar geword het as die besef eindelijk moet deurbreek dat dié kritiek teen die heersende landspolitiek nie noodwendig slegs uit die één „verderflike" hoek van die „kommunisme" en die „liberalisme" kan kom nie. 'n Mens wil nie voortydig juig nie, maar laat ons dan tog maar hoop dat die erkenning mettertyd ook sal deurbreek dat apartheid nie die hoogste maatstaf is vir wat geglo behoort te word en vir wat goed en reg is nie, maar dat die norme van die Woord van God ook op die geloof in apartheid en die praktyke daarvan toegepas moet word. En laat ons verder hoop dat daar hier en daar 'n gedagte begin deurskemer dat daar moontlik tog sprake kan wees van 'n alternatief en dat apartheid nie so 'n absolute heilsweg is soos wat dit van

politieke en kerklike preekstoele so luid verkondig word nie.

Dit is inderdaad maar 'n floue hoop, maar soos aan 'n strooihalm wil ons daaraan vasgryp. Vir Suid-Afrika sal daar maar één redding wees uit die draaikolk van sy fatale apartheidsbegogeling, nl. as daar weer gewilligheid kom om na Gods Woord te luister.

Intussen — dit is die tweede opmerking — moet dit ons ook nie tot 'n alte groot optimisme stem nie. Die glansie van hoop word meteens weer verdonker deur die feit dat die uitdaging so uitdagend gestel word. Dit is voorlopig nog onmiskenbaar duidelik dat dit kom vanuit 'n selfversekerde stellingname in 'n gewaande absolute onaantasbaarheid van die apartheidsideologie. Voorasnog is daar geen tekens van bereidheid om werklik ernstig te luister en argumente te oorweeg nie. 'n Mens kry veeleer die onbehaaglike indruk dat daar na „bewyse" gesoek word. Die absoluutheid van apartheid as unieke heilsweg vir Suid-Afrika moet uit die kritiek wat daarteen ingebring word, des te ontwyfelbaarder bewese blyk. En, waarskynlik omdat apartheid self pretendeer om so 'n duidelik omlynde ideologie te wees — in elk geval laat hy hom op alle samelewingsvlakke met 'n onbuigsame en meedoënlose konsekwentheid geld — word daar by sy kritici daarop aangedring om voor 'n dag te kom met 'n ewe duidelik omlynde alternatief: om sodoende te bewys dat dit op niks anders sal neerkom nie as 'n integrasiepolitiek wat hom, net soos

apartheid, op alle samelewingsvlakke met 'n onbuigsame en meedoënlose konsekwentheid sal laat geld. As daar maar op hierdie wyse bewys sou kon word dat dit in die Christelike getuienis teen apartheid in die grond van die saak dáárom gaan, sou persone en instansies wat hulle vir hul veroordeling van die ideologie op die Woord van God en die waarhede van die Christelike geloof beroep, ontmasker, geïdentifiseer en geplaas kon word.

Christelike instansies wat die heersende politieke koers in Suid-Afrika radikaal veroordeel, sal gewis ook wys wees as hulle in gedagte hou dat dit die taak van politieke partye is om politieke programme uit te werk; dat daar op die vlak van die partyestryd inderdaad ook politieke partye is (en was) wat teenoor die apartheidspolitiek met alternatiewe programme radikaal krities staan (en gestaan het); en dat hulle deur wetgewing gedwing is òf om op te hou om te bestaan òf om in die praktyk nie te beoefen wat in beginsel geglo word nie. Die „gemengde“ lidmaatskap van hierdie Christelike instansies maak dit vir hulle uiters riskant om hulle te ver op die terrein van die praktiese politiek te begewe, juis omdat hulle so radikaal veroordelend staan teenoor die politiek van die dag en op geloofsgronde hulle eie inrigting nie daaraan kan laat konformeer nie.

Weliswaar is daar geen twyfel aan dat oor die apartheidsideologie juis vanuit die Christelike geloof 'n ondubbelsinnige veroordeling uitgespreek moet word nie. En hoeveel vergrypinge daar ook al mag gewees het teen mense wat op die vlak van die Christelike geloof hierdie veroordeling laat hoor het, in Suid-Afrika bestaan die vryheid nog om op hierdie vlak die teendeel van apartheid te bely en te beleef. Christelike instansies sal daarom tweemaal moet dink voordat hulle vanselfsprekende „alternatiewe“ vir apartheid en sy onregspraktyke so gaan uitspel dat dit as 'n politieke program vertolk kan word. Die uitnodiging daartoe kan 'n gevaarlike sirenesang blyk te wees.

Maar dan, 'n derde opmerking.

Dit beteken nie, en mag ook nie so geïnterpreteer word, dat Christelike instansies òf 'n essensiële deel van hulle getuienis ter wille van eie voordeel en veiligheid opsetlik moet verswyg òf dat hulle in beskaamdheid hul onvermoë moet bely om die alternatief duidelik en omlynd aan te toon nie. Want wat op die oomblik die mees essensiële taak van die Christelike getuienis is, is om dit sonder ophou te sê en weer te sê dat dit 'n valse probleemstelling is om van 'n „alternatief“ van apartheid te praat as daarmee bedoel word 'n alternatiewe geestelike grondslag vir die inrigting van die veelrassige Suid-Afrikaanse samelewing. Apartheid, soos in Suid-Afrika geglo en toegepas, is immers die tot ideologie verstolde verwerping van elke konsepsie van samelewing. Dit is die radikaalste ontkenning denkbaar, sowel van die feit dat daar samelewing in Suid-Afrika moet wees as van die noodsaaklikheid

dat daar 'n geestelike grondslag vir die inrigting van hierdie samelewing gevind moet word. Dit is die ideologie van kapitulasie voor die eis en van ontwyking van die taak om in Suid-Afrika die feitlik bestaande veelrassige samelewing te sien wat tot gemeenskap georden moet word. Daarom kan dit ook nooit die geestelike grondslag van 'n samelewingsorde wees nie. Dit is die ideologie van die bestending van chaos.

Om hierdie rede is, vanuit die oogpunt van apartheid gesien, miljoene nie-blanke Suid-Afrikans hier, in hulle enigste, Godgewe vaderland, 'n politieke en maatskaplike „probleem“. 'n Grondiger politieke chaotisering is nouliks denkbaar as in 'n land waar die owerheid opgeskeep sit met miljoene kinders van die land, nuttige burgers met wie hy geen raad weet nie. Ons politieke leiers en apartheidsvoorgangers, en m.n. die Eerste Minister, wéét bv. nie wat die toekoms van die Kleurlinge hier in hulle eie land behoort te wees nie (en die krank-sinnigste is nog dat hulle geloof word vir so 'n openhartige erkenning!); hulle weet ook nie wat die toekoms van die Bantoe in die „blanke“ en stedelike gebiede moet wees nie; en hulle weet waargtig ook nie hoe donker die toekoms vir die blankes hier is vanweë die politiek wat hulle bedryf nie.

Dit is daarom 'n totale misvatting om van 'n „alternatief“ vir apartheid te praat. Daar kan slegs op 'n haastige en uiters dringende **korrektief** aangedring word. En hierdie korrektief is so voor die hand liggend dat dit uit die aard van die saak slegs in die duidelikste taal uitgedruk kan word — te duidelik dat dit nog vir enige misverstand vatbaar kan wees. Die korrektief vir die idee van apartheid, dus van hierdie radikale negasie van die fundamentele waarheid dat Suid-Afrika nou eenmaal 'n land is waar 'n verskeidenheid van rasse saam lewe en saam móet lewe, is die nugtere en realistiese aanvaarding van hierdie feit. Dáár sal daar begin moet word: by die besef dat daar in Suid-Afrika geen apartheid kan wees nie, behalwe as onvermydelik onheilsbarende chaotiseringsprogram. Eers wanneer ons van ons ideologiese verbystering weer tot die eenvoudige en onloënbare werklikheid teruggekeer het, en hierdie elementêre erkenning maak dat Suid-Afrika in sy geheel niks minder die enigste vaderland is van die Kleurling en die Bantoe as wat dit dié van die blankes is nie, kan daar sinvol gevra word na die geestelike grondslag waarop hierdie samelewing ingerig en georden moet word. En die Christelike getuienis het hierin 'n basiese bydrae te lewer vanuit die skatte van kennis en insigte van die Godsopenbaring waarmee dit toegerus is.

The Crisis

DR. W. B. DE VILLIERS

What follows is the gist of an address held by Dr. de Villiers at the Ranch House College, Salisbury, Rhodesia, in October last year under the auspices of the Salisbury Council of Churches. It constitutes the first part of a trilogy under the general heading "Positive Christian Action in a Time of Crisis".

I am full of humility as I look at you — as I look at the face of Black Africa and the face of White Africa, as I look at the problem of Africa — knowing that you expect an answer from me. Before me, I see representatives of both black and white Africa, gathered in an honest search for an answer.

In this itself there lies hope: that there are still some one hundred and twenty people here who are prepared seriously and concernedly to search for the answer to problems which are beyond most of us. For one hundred and twenty are at least ten times the number of disciples with whom Christ started his Church. We have no reason to be discouraged from the outset, therefore. Numbers do not count in the long run. Sincerity does, willingness does, love does, dedicatedness to the cause of Christ and his Church does. And there are no easy answers. There are no blanket solutions. We all participate in the eternal struggle between Good and Evil. And every day we must go on our knees to thank God that the struggle is essentially His, and that He has already gained the victory through Christ — also on our behalf. All that remains for us is to grasp for ourselves the victory achieved 2000 years ago on the Cross. Let us thank God for the depth of our concern. Let us also thank Him for the victory which is ours already.

NO SPECIAL CRISIS

In speaking about the crisis in which you as Rhodesians and I as a South African find ourselves, I must immediately point out to avoid any misunderstanding that we are not living at any special time of crisis. To regard ourselves as being involved in an exceptionally critical situation, is to be arrogantly self-centred. From the dawn of Christianity there have been times of crisis and ours is perhaps only of trivial significance compared to others which Christianity has survived.

It is as well to realise from the outset that the life of the Christian is by its very nature a life of crisis. There can be no such thing as "crisisless" Christian living: a quiet, calm, restful happy, benign Christian life. Nowhere in the Bible do I find any indication as to the possible existence of a heaven upon earth although man has indeed made numerous futile attempts to establish for himself such a heaven upon earth. This, after all, was what Judas Iscariot mistakenly and tragically wanted Jesus to do. This was the unattainable ideal which lay at the root of the Neo-Gnosticism propounded by Joachim of Flora in the early days of the Christian Church. This was the dream inspiring the French populace when they crowned a statue of the Goddess of Reason on the Place de la Concorde — and immediately proceeded in a most unreasonable manner to slaughter thousands of their own compatriots during what now is known as the French Revolution. This was what made the Pilgrim Fathers embark on the Mayflower to search for a New World where peace and justice would reign supreme — a plan which did not quite work out that way. And I seem to recollect that the Bolshevik Revolution in Russia was also started with a view to creating the perfect society and that what impelled Adolf Hitler on his paranoiac course was the wild vision of a racially pure Aryan state.

All these arrogant attempts by men to transform our sinful world into Paradise failed abysmally. Heaven is not for man to create. The Kingdom of God is not ours to order. God Himself will establish His Kingdom of glory in His own good time. In the meantime you and I are living in a time of crisis — every day of our lives, every hour of our lives, every minute of our lives. Let us not delude ourselves: our earthly life, even and especially as Christians, is a matter of painful, often miserable growing in grace. For growth entails growing

pains and not even the Christian, when he dies, dare say: "Behold, I am fully grown; I have grown perfect!"

When we speak, therefore, of a time of crisis, we are speaking of all time for all of us who call ourselves Christians.

This immediately, however, leads to the quite logical question: But why should this be so? Why can't we have more peace? Why is there so little rest for our conscience? Why must we worry so much, be so concerned about ourselves and the world we live in? What is it that makes the Christian's life a life of continual crisis?

BIBLICAL ANSWERS

Are we really serious in demanding an answer? Then we need turn no further than the Bible which gives us the answer quite explicitly. Basically, it tells us, our life is bound to be a life of crisis for three reasons:

The first reason, says the Bible, is that everyone of us as an individual is called upon by God through Christ to stand in a dialectical, dialogical, personal relationship with the Other — be he God or the human neighbour. We are called not to live life for ourselves, not merely to please ourselves and to seek security for ourselves. We are called to live with and for the other; with and for God Himself, with and for our neighbour, who is in a very real sense God in the flesh standing next to us.

And this in itself immediately causes crisis. For God is not like I am and I am not God, although I would undoubtedly like to be. I am created after the image of God, true. But there is a vast difference between the Original and the image. He created me a person, like He Himself is. But I have, by the very nature inherent in personality, been created a unique person, distinct from the Person of God and the person who is my neighbour. We stand poles apart,

polarically opposed, like the positive and negative poles of an electrical battery. True, they are meant to make contact and thus to produce electricity. But the electric spark on contact between them is caused exactly because they are such diametrical opposites. Contact between them leads to "fireworks". So, too, does contact between the I and the Other lead to "fireworks", to crisis. Living in what Martin Buber, Ferdinand Ebner and others called an I-Thou relationship is essentially crisis-living and we experience this all too clearly in our day to day human relationship with our fellow-men. We who, as Christians, are called to live in a relationship of truth, righteousness and love with our neighbour know that this is jolly hard work, a full-time job, a critical task often leading from crisis to crisis.

The second major reason the Bible provides why our life is bound to be a life of crisis is the unescapable fact that, although we are created and called to live in an I-Thou relationship with God and with our neighbour, these relationships have been decisively disrupted by human sin.

THE CHASM OF SIN

Sin has caused a humanly unbridgeable chasm to open up between me and God, between my family and God, my group and God, my nation and God, my world and God. All human efforts to reach out to God across this chasm have failed and are bound to fail after the finality of sin. Man is firmly cast from Paradise. All his scientific achievements and philosophies fall short in the end. Despite Bonaventure's fond dream, no such thing as an *itinerarium mentis ad deum* is possible.

And what holds true of God also holds true of my neighbour, His physical representative in my life: my fellow-man, my wife, my child, my friend, my enemy. That is why our human history is to such a major extent merely a chronicle of the misunderstandings between man and man. That is why our newspapers are always full of reports about the rifts between husbands and wives, between parents and children, between racial groups and between the various nations. The chasm of sin has separated man from man, and man has become, in the words of the philosopher Leibniz a monad soul, an island in a vast ocean of loneliness. The utter isolation of the individual

has become the natural state of man. Absolute loneliness, godforsakenness, manforsakenness has become the universal lot of man. And loneliness, the end-product of sin, causes the gravest personal crisis in our lives, and ultimately, as we all know and fear, madness and death.

There is, however, so the Bible teaches us, thank God, an antidote for sin. But this remedy in itself is a cause of crisis and inevitably entails crisis-living on the part of Christians.

To escape the madness of sin it is utterly and eternally necessary that reconciliation be effected between God and man and hence between man and man. And this urgent necessity causes crisis: the crisis of Christianity. This is what Christianity is about. Reconciliation. This is what Christ's whole life was about, His death was about. This is what His Resurrection is about. What the New Testament is about. This is what the Church is about.

For Biblical reconciliation has very little in common with conciliation and compromise. It is nothing so pacifying and diplomatic. The confusion of these two issues is one of the cardinal mistakes being made by so many Churchmen of our day. Compromise can never be the foundation upon which reconciliation in the Biblical sense is based; rather principled controversy, a courageous facing up to the truth, repentance, a confession of sin, a subjugation of selfishness, an admission of the defeat of personal pride, a taking up of a cross — a willing acceptance of crisis-living in the situation caused by the confrontation of Good and Evil.

RELATIONSHIP

To sum up, then: we as Christians are always in the middle of crisis for three basic reasons. Created in the image of God, we are called to live in relationship with the Other. The relationship has been decisively severed through our sinfulness. And we must urgently be reconciled with the Other or go mad and die. It isn't a matter of mere convenience or of our pleasure. It is a matter of life and death for every Christian. This is his true *raison d'être*, the ultimate meaning of his human existence, the very essence of his being: to rediscover and re-enter the relationship for which he was created through the reconciliation in Christ. And like Christ's life

started with the crisis at Bethlehem and ended with the crisis on Golgotha, so our lives are destined to be crisis lives. And he who does not accept this, dare not call himself a Christian, for this would border on blasphemy.

The primary cause of the crisis which is so characteristic of our lives as Christians is, of course, sin. For it lies in the very nature of sin that it divides, and division obviously lies at the root of the crisis we have to face. At the most basic level, sin causes a vast chasm to open between the self I am and the self I would like to be. For, according to St. Paul, "the good which I want to do, I fail to do; but what I do is the wrong which is against my will." I am divided in myself. I can truly be described, in terms of the title Emil Brunner chose for his monumental work on Christian anthropology, as "*Der Mensch im Widerspruch*": man in revolt against himself, man the schizophrenic.

And from this fundamental inner division flows all the other divisions of sin: the division between man and God, between man and man, between age and youth, between groups and races and nations. For the true nature of sin, Biblically speaking, and contrary to what so many people seem to think, is not to be found in the flesh, its temptations and its weak willingness to succumb to them. If this were the case, a good surgeon, well versed in the art of efficient amputation, could relieve us of most of our sins. The essence of sin lies in what the Bible itself calls *hubris*, pride, arrogance, self-esteem. It consists of man's saying to himself: "I, too, would like to savour the fruit of the Tree of the Knowledge of Good and Evil. I would like to become like God Himself. I would like to be God myself. I would like to determine my own destiny, whatever God may think about it. My life is my own concern; not God's or my neighbour's. To hell with everybody else! I will go my own way according to my own lights."

And thus man sets himself up upon a pedestal, starts deifying himself and kneeling before one god only, the great god Self. Thus Faust sells his soul to the devil. And when man sets himself up next to, in opposition to God as the ultimate, this is when sin really starts. For that is the time when man starts telling God (and his neighbour) to disappear, to keep His distance, to stop clamouring about the

personal relationship for which he was created. This is the time when man finally convinces himself that he can "go it alone".

Sin is essentially pride, self-idolisation. The Self becomes the ikon, the totem pole before which I start kneeling: adoring myself, hallowing myself, tenderly and obsequiously asking myself what next would be pleasing unto myself.

SECURITY

And sin is also, therefore, inevitably — if I may coin a word — **self-securisation**: a seeking of security for myself, for my family, for my group, for my nation. The sinner instinctively refuses to burn his boats, to cross any Rubicons, to relinquish even the tiniest personal security — whatever happens to the rest of humanity. As long as he himself has something to fall back on. He can never trust God enough to make his life depend on His assurances — on Christ. So he starts building up his own securities: his bank balance, his investment portfolio, his contribution to his own particular (pressure-) group, his obeisance to the national ideology serving his own interests.

Security for myself, for my own good, for my children. Security is my God, the God of the 20th century — as it has been the God of the past 19 centuries. Man's ultimate search is for security. And where does he, even the Christian, seek for security? Not where the Bible tells him to seek it: in Christ alone. He seeks it in his own self-made securities, in his selfish little heaven-upon-earth: in his capitalist wealth, in his Communist sharing of wealth, in his Naziist ideal of a pure Aryan society, in his Christian-National dogma of a clean and clinical separation between racial groups.

And all of these ideals of self-securisation amount to the same thing: **hubris**, pride, personal arrogance, Sin.

Sin — this is the true spawn of the Devil. In closing, therefore, I must briefly ask you to have a close look at just a few of the many faces of Sin, the ultimate cause of all the crises in our lives, even as Christians.

FACES OF SIN

Firstly, our **personal sin**. Need I dwell upon this? We all know it too

well: our resistance from early childhood to the Christian precepts we were taught at mother's knee; our inclination to look after ourselves at the expense of others; our Pauline problem of doing what we do not wish to do in our heart of hearts; our inner division — an inner division which has landed so many of us on the psychiatrist's couch. To be sure, the **individual** bears one face of sin.

The **family** bears another face of sin. Just think for a moment of all the broken and breaking up families in our present-day society. Think of our children going to the devil: the permissive society, the casual drug-taking, the teen-age immorality. Sin is breaking up the very elements of our society, our families, and its divisive influence is noticeable everywhere: in the divisions between husbands and wives, between fathers and sons, between mothers and daughters.

And the division of sin has infiltrated the whole structure of our **society**, which reveals another one of its evil faces. Especially in our multi-racial society in Southern Africa this has become all too true. I, as a white man, am almost relieved to be so racially different from the black man and the brown man and the yellow man. So, according to the apostles of Black Power in America, are black men apparently.

Our distinctiveness gives us a peculiar "identity". And our identity, in our own sinful hearts, gives us a right to arrogance, HUBRIS and separating ourselves from those who are not like us. The nicely clear-cut division between the races gives us a clear cause about which to quarrel, just like the division between the erudite and the illiterate, the rich and the poor, the accredited and the non-accredited. We love our distinctions and divisions all too dearly and love blowing them up, because we are sinners and because these divisions are essentially the divisions of sin. Even we Christians: even we all too frequently forget that it was God who created all these natural divisions between us but who expects us, despite and beyond and across our divisions, to be His children and to be one body through Christ. Even we are all too fond of our divisions and various identities to obey the Pauline injunction to be members of the one body, of Christ, to become the flag-bearers of the one and only Kingdom of God.

PERSPECTIVE

Let us, at least, therefore, deal with the crisis that we face in its proper perspective. It is not the worst crisis in history. It is not a crisis peculiar to our time. It is the crisis of all time: the crisis of sin. When we are long dead, our children will still be dealing with this crisis — like our forefathers dealt with it before our time. It is the crisis of sin: of man, called to live after the image of God, battling against his true calling and denying the God after whose image he was created.

But when we start looking at the crisis of sin in perspective, please do not let us make light of it. Let us confront it face to face. Let us appreciate it in all its seriousness. For it is a crisis of our own making: the crisis caused by our personal sin, by the sin of our family, by the sin of our own special group, by the sin of our nation, by the sin of man — the solidarity of man in sin.

And let us also not regard sin as an impersonal factor in our human affairs: a mere **fatum**, a blind destiny. For as much as sin is committed personally, with all the crises that it causes in our personal lives and the life of our society, so much is it caused by a Person, the person of Satan. It may sound odd and medieval for a theologian to declare in this our enlightened 20th century that he believes in the Devil and his personal inspiration of **hubris** or Sin. But this is what the Bible teaches us, and however fleeting its references to Satan, there can be no doubt about his very real existence and his very pernicious influence on our lives.

As far as we, His creatures, are concerned God still has to deal with his counterpart, Satan, Good with Evil; and this is the eternal struggle in which all of us are embroiled. Hence our hankering after God. Hence our hankering after Sin and its Originator. Hence the crisis in which we perpetually find ourselves.

We are, whether we like it or not, engaged, not in a cold war, but in a hot war for the very salvation of our souls and the continuance of our Christian society.

BANTOE-TUISLANDE

Is Die Beleid van Bantoe-Tuislande (Die Sogenaamde Groot Apartheid) 'n Mite, 'n Fiksie, of 'n Eerlike, Reële Oplossing?

Die verhouding van die rasse in Suid-Afrika word deur baie Christene oor die hele wêreld tereg gesien as 'n saak waarby nie slegs Suid-Afrika belang het nie. Die sg. „rassevraagstuk” is immers een van wêreld-omvang. Die aandag van die hele Christelike wêreld is dan ook gerig op die wyse waarop dit hier in Suid-Afrika benader word, veral omdat die afmetings wat die probleem van rasseverhoudinge hier aanneem, soveel groter is as waar ook al ter wêreld. Ook in Nederland is daar persone en instellings wat nóg van bemoeisiekheid nóg van oningeligtheid verdink kan word, wat dit met groot aandag bestudeer. Dit geskied nie slegs uit opregte belangstelling en besorgdheid nie, maar veral ook uit die besef van betrokkenheid. Die onderstaande artikel getuig daarvan. Die skrywer, wat verbonde is aan die Sociaal-Wetenskapelijk Instituut van die Vrije Universiteit te Amsterdam, was so vriendelik om 'n lesing wat hy tydens die „College Plurale Samenlevingen” op 10 Desember 1968 te Amsterdam gehou het, aan PRO VERITATE af te staan vir publikasie. Drs. Feddema het ons land ook al by verskeie geleenthede besoek.

DRS. J. P. FEDDEMA

1. Die beleid van Bantoe-tuislande is en bly 'n vorm van segregasie, 'n middel wat in die geskiedenis al dikwels beproef is in rasseverhoudinge (meestal as 'n oorheersings- of kompetisietegniek van die dominante groep), terwyl dit origens lyk na 'n tydelike en tydgebonde middel wat nie, of nouliks, daarop kan aanspraak maak om enige langdurige resultaat te hê nie.

2. Met name t.a.v. die Negers het die pogings van apartheid/segregasie en swart-Sionisme/„back to Africa” ens. 'n mislukking geblyk te wees.

3. Veral in die huidige tyd van (a) toenemende wêreldeenheid, (b) toenemende kommunikasie, (c) toenemende mobiliteit, (d) toenemende spreiding van demokrasie en ander verligte ideale (N.B. Dit was veral die Aufklärung wat 'n einde gemaak het aan die gedwonge segregasie van die Jode in baie lande), (e) toenemende spreiding van onderwys, ens., lyk dit of segregasie 'n onuitvoerbare anachronisme is.

4. Die tuislande-beleid beoog nie die afskaffing van die kaste-skeiding nie en bly in wese diskriminerend, omdat resente blanke immigrante, bv. uit Griekeland, in teenstelling tot die cutentieke bruin en swart inwoners, wel aanvaar word as volwaardige inwoners van die Republiek.

5. Die tuislande-beleid kry meer en meer die karakter van die mite vir die toekoms en 'n rasionalisasie vir die hede.

(a) Waar Verwoerd se latere uitsprake wel min of meer geïnterpreteer kan word as beloftes vir die uiteindelijke selfstandigheid van die Bantoe-tuislande, is daar sedertdien geen aanwysings van offisiële kant in dié rigting nie; oor 'n streefdatum, hoe ver oek al in die toekoms, word geen woord meer gerep nie.

(b) Enkele vooruitstrewende nasionalistiese Afrikaner - intellektueles wat grootskeepse versnelling van die ontwikkeling van die tuislande bepleit met die argument dat die huidige apartheidsmatreëls alleen as oorgangsmatreëls geregverdig kan word, kry die nee-woord met die motivering dat apartheid in prinsipe nie as 'n oorgangsmatreël beskou kan word nie.

6. Die tuislande-konsep is 'n miskenning van die akkulturasieproses wat in die meervoudige Suid-Afrikaanse samelewing reeds 'n lang tradisie het, maar wat hom met name na die Tweede Wêreldoorlog sterk afteken en eweëns in die stamgebiede 'n merkwaardige intensivering/versnelling ondergaan.

7. 'n Snelle ontwikkeling van die Bantoe-tuislande is uitgeslote solank as wat „Pretoria” vashou aan die politiek (wat nativisties aandoen) van romantisering/idealisering van die tradisionele Bantoe-kultuur — 'n politiek wat saamhang met die miskenning van die akkulturasieprosesse in Suid-Afrika soos in punt 6 aange-
toon.

Dit geld met name solank as wat (a) die vorming van individuele grondbesit (sogenaamd strydig met die stamtradisie), (b) verstedeliking, (c) grootskeepse industrialisasie, (d) partikuliere kapitaal in die tuislande ge-weer/teengegaan word.

8. Die plan van die sogenaamde grensnywerhede is geen reële alternatief vir die nie-toelating van partikuliere kapitaal in die Bantoe-tuislande nie.

(a) Die nywerhede sal alleen tot so 'n vorm van desentralisasie aange-trek kan word as die daartoe aange-wese gebiede infrastruktureel nie te veel moeilikhede oplewer nie en veral nie te afgeleë is nie.

(b) Grensnywerhede bring nuwe stedelike kerns in aansyn wat soos bv. Rosslyn (ong. 20 km. van Pretoria) en Hammarsdale (naby Pietermaritzburg) op die duur sal saamvloei in die oë.

(c) Grensnywerhede soos wat dit vandag reeds gevestig is en slegs in 'n enkele geval suksesvol is (nl. dié vlakby Pretoria), bevorder integrasie (sien 8 b.)

(d) Grensnywerhede, volgens die voorstelling wat in teorie daarvan gemaak is, sal ook die wedersydse afhanklikheid van blank en nie-blank eerder laat toeneem as laat afneem.

9. Die Bantoe, wat origens van oorsprong meer vechouer is as vee-teler, het as trekarbeider of as permanente stedeling getoon dat hy aanleg het vir arbeid in die moderne

industrie. Dit sal dan ook makliker wees om van hom 'n geskoolde industrie-arbeider te maak as 'n moderne landbouer, afgesien van die feit dat vir moderne landbou die omvang van die huidige stamgebiede minder as 'n kwart bedra wat werklik nodig is.

10. Dit skyn asof die tuislande-beleid moeilik gekombineer kan word met die ekonomiese kragte in Suid-Afrika as gevolg van die hoë ekonomiese bloei van hierdie land en prosesse van industrialisasie en verstedeliking, kragte wat eerder verenigend as skeidend werk en elke jaar die stroom arbeidskragte uit die stamgebiede weer laat toeneem. Trouens, die Witwatersrand, opgebou deur blank en swart, is en bly die ekonomiese hart van Suid-Afrika, 'n hart wat die sjirurgiese ingryping van skeiding/verdeling nie sal gedoë nie.

11. Afgesien van die feit dat die Suid-Afrikaanse ekonomie sonder die vele miljoene Bantoe-arbeidskragte sou ineenstort, stuit die tuislande-beleid af op die onwil van die blanke bevolking.

(a) Hulle toon geen gewilligheid om afstand te doen van die vele Bantoe-bediendes nie, ens.

(b) Daar is te weinig offergesindheid by die blanke belastingbetaler vir die ontwikkeling van die sogenaamde nie-blanke gebiede.

12. Ook die regering van Suid-Afrika blyk in wese nie bereid te wees tot 'n ontwikkeling op groot skaal van die Bantoe-tuislande nie.

(a) Die begroting van die ministerie van Bantoe-ontwikkeling bedra nog geen tiende van dié van die ministerie van verdediging nie.

(b) In die eerste ses ontwikkelingsjare van die tuislande is daar slegs 945 nuwe industriële werkplekke tot stand gebring, terwyl dit volgens die Tomlinson-verslag minstens 300,000 en volgens enkele progressiewe Afrikaner-intellektueles minstens een miljoen moes wees. Prof. J. P. van S. Bruwer, een van die grondleggers van die gedagte van Bantoe-tuislande, skryf op 3 Julie 1966 teleurgesteld of verbitterd in „Die Beeld”: „Ons lewe eintlik in 'n droom van teoretiese bevrediging, van wetmatige skimbeelde van geformuleerde beleid” . . . (maar) . . . „na twintig jaar Nasionale bewind het ons bitter min verder gekom aan die ware beeld van die afsonderlike ontwikkeling, van die uitbouing van 'n gesonde volkerebeleid . . .”

13. Sowel die Tomlinson-kommissie as ander ondersoekinge het aange-ton dat die infrastrukturele situasie van die Bantoe-tuislande van so 'n aard is dat vir 'n redelike ekonomiese bestaan meer as die helfte van die tans aanwesige 3.5-4 miljoen Bantoes die stamland sal moet verlaat, hoeseer die nasionalistiese Afrikaners nog steeds droom van 'n toekoms waarin die stroom van die migrasie in 'n teenoorgestelde rigting sal beweeg, nl. na die tuislande, hoewel, so skryf prof. Bruwer in genoemde artikel bitter ironies, „oor die jaar nou nie meer gepraat (word) nie”.

14. Die Transkei fungeer as die sg. model-tuisland, maar dit lyk nie asof daar in die nabye toekoms ooit 'n tweede Transkei van enige belang (die Ciskei is daarvoor te klein) in die lewe geroep sal kan word nie.

(a) Die Zoeloes weier nog steeds om hul medewerking te gee aan die tuisland-idee en bowendien is hulle gebied hiervoor te veel versnipperd.

(b) Die orige stamgebiede — origins net soos die terrein van die Zoeloes baie moeilik tot 'n geheel te maak — bevind hulle in 'n baie armlike toestand as gevolg van erosie, langdurige droogtes, hongersnode, ens.

(c) Suidwes-Afrika skyn hierin voorrang te kry bo die eie land.

15. Die planne om die idee van Bantoe-tuislande aantrekliker te maak deur die Suid-Afrikaanse tuislande saam te voeg met die voormalige Engelse protektorate en so dus die sg. nie-blanke grondbesit van 13% tot 45% uit te brei — ook die Tomlinson-verslag stel dit voor — het misluk. In die lig van die veelrassige basis van die jong state soos Lesotho en Botswana is 'n saamvoeging ook in die toekoms uitgeslote. Die „gemenebes”-idee wat deur dr. Verwoerd gelanseer is, skyn daarmee eweëns van die baan te wees.

16. Die tuislande-beleid bring geen oplossing vir die ruim twee miljoen Kleurlinge en Asiëte in Suid-Afrika nie.

Hulle histories gegroeide regte in Suid-Afrika word hulle meer en meer deur die een wet na die ander ontnem, terwyl sowel minister Botha as minister Viljoen nog in die herfs van 1968 'n soort „Kleurling-stan” of 'n Kleurling-tuisland as 'n hersenskim van die hand gewys het.

17. Die tuislande-beleid bied geen oplossing vir die 7-8 miljoen ontstamde Bantoes wat buite die tuislande woon en grotendeels daar gebore en getoë is nie. Ook die mees ontwikkelde Bantoe sal daar altyd, net soos die Kleurlinge, tweede- of derde-rangse burgers bly. Noudat nagenoeg alle ander kanale vir hulle gesluit is om uiting te kan gee aan hulle gedagtes, gevoelens en frustrasies, laat die Bantoe dit nie na om die kans wat die tuislande-beleid bied, aan te gryp om nog enige invloed op die blanke regering te kan uitoefen nie. Dit spreek vanself dat hulle nooit met die tuislande-plan genoë sal en kan neem as 'n afdoende alternatief vir hulle verlangens nie. Om politieke regte te verleen vir 'n gebied wat mense nie, of nouliks, ken nie, lyk nie baie reëel nie. Selfs uit eie kring kom die kritiek die regering tegemoet: „Die idee dat 'n volk wat buite sy gebied woon, genoeg daaraan het dat hulle „deel het aan die gemeenskaplike grondbesit van die volk’ is alte idealisties gesien, soos ook die nuwere idee wat in die jongste tyd na vore kom, dat ontwikkeling van 'n volk as volk kan plaasvind los van sy land”. („Woord en Daad”, Mei 1968).

18. Die tuislande-beleid bied geen oplossing vir die integrasie-vresende blankes nie, ook nie wat getalsverhoudinge betref nie. Selfs die mees grootskeepse aanpak in die ontwikkeling van die tuislande sal nie kan verhinder dat in die resterende gedeelte van Suid-Afrika (N.B. 86-87% van die grondgebied) die Bantoes die blankes altyd ver in getalle sal oortref nie, afgesien nog van die Kleurlinge, en dat integrasie ten spyte van alle maatreëls voortgaan nie. As dit nou reeds al heeltemal onjuis is om hierdie resterende gedeelte die sg. „blanke” gebied te noem vanweë die Kleurlinge en die 7-8 miljoen Bantoes wat daar woonagtig is, dan lyk dit heeltemal na 'n mite om te dink dat via die tuislande-plan veelrassige Suid-Afrika 'n „witmansland” sou kan bly.

(Uit die Nederlands vertaal).

"WE PREACH NOT OURSELVES..."

— E. A. DU PLESSIS*

"We preach not ourselves, but Christ Jesus as Lord, and ourselves as your servants for Jesus sake." — 2 Corinthians 4: 5.

These words were spoken by the greatest Christian missionary of all times, Paul. He referred to one of the earliest groups of people converted from paganism to Christianity, namely the church in Corinth. These words clearly define the message and the pattern of service of the Christian faith. The answers to the "WHAT?" and "HOW?" questions relating to the Christian faith can be found in these words.

It is now exactly 1905 years ago since the first and probably the worst persecution took place against Christians in Rome in the year 64 A.D. under the Emperor Nero. The apostles Paul and Peter probably met their death as martyrs at this time. They boldly suffered martyrdom because the message they proclaimed was greater than the Roman Empire; theirs was a message different from that of Caesar. In short, they proclaimed the message of Jesus Christ. Since then the mighty Roman Empire has collapsed. Many another empire has risen and fallen; civilizations have come and gone. Yet the Christian faith has in the meantime become established as a truly universal faith.

THE CHRISTIAN COMPULSION

The fact that the Christian faith has become fully universal is the work of Christ and Christ alone. There is very little, if anything, in this state of affairs for Christians to boast of nor does it give them the green light for complacency. Christians are still a minority and the numbers who even profess to be Christians are fast dwindling rather than increasing. It is in the light of these harsh facts that Christians would do well to restate, re-iterate and relive the words of Paul, namely "We preach not ourselves, but Christ Jesus as Lord, and ourselves as your servants for Jesus' sake". These words press with a particularly compelling urgency and an almost irresistible force on the South African church. Paul quite clearly regarded the message as a matter of life and death. Something unique had happened. God had become flesh; the eternal God had become man in Jesus Christ, entering our life, our world, teaching us, healing us, feeding us, and finally dying for us. His death and resurrection meant the forgiveness of sin and the gift of eternal life. Equipped with this vivid experience and certain

knowledge Christians could shout with joy because they certainly had something to shout about. "We can't help speaking of the things we have seen and heard," (Acts 4: 16), Peter and John said when they were charged in court. Paul said "Necessity is laid upon me. Woe is me if I do not preach the Gospel!" (I Cor. 9: 16). One cannot help feeling the power, the compelling urgency and the irresistible force emanating from these words.

SERVICE AND SACRIFICE

The words of Paul fall very neatly into two parts i.e. the message itself ("We preach not ourselves, but Christ Jesus as Lord.") and the service ("as your servants for Jesus' sake"). It is therefore to the second point that we now turn our attention.

The whole earthly ministry of Christ was marked by passionate service rendered to people. "He went about doing good" is literally true. He healed the sick, He fed the hungry and He completely identified Himself with the joys and sorrows of the people. He really cared.

This then is what Paul had in mind when he wrote 'as your servants for Jesus' sake'. The Message of the Christian faith is to find practical expression. Actions speak louder than words. A Church is ultimately to be judged not by the quality of its preacher alone (which certainly is essential) but by the quality of its service. "Not everyone who says to me 'Lord, Lord' shall enter the Kingdom of heaven, but he who does the will of my Father who is in heaven". (Matthew 7: 21).

THE "MESSAGE" OF APARTHEID

Nobody can say any more that Apartheid is only a political policy. Apartheid has become the religion of a large section of the South African white people. This doctrine is preach-

ed with religious fervour and it is applied with fanatical sincerity. "Apartheid is the traditional South African way of life" is a phrase repeatedly heard at home and abroad. Paul said "We preach not ourselves" (not our ideas or opinions, way of life or civilization) "but Christ Jesus as Lord". This then is the crux of the Christian message. Apartheid extends its influence over the whole of life, private as well as public, and exacts full submission of the individual to its demands. To this end innumerable laws have been enacted by the South African Legislative Assembly. In the process people have lost all the basic human rights as enshrined in the Declaration of Human Rights. A person has lost the freedom of assembly, movement, residence, marriage, work and worship — to mention only a few.

With such a wicked situation prevailing Christians would do well to ask themselves: what does the Christian faith say or what is the Christian faith all about? Surely it requires a complete and total submission to the will of God as revealed by Christ. It is therefore in the light of the work, life, death and resurrection of Christ that Apartheid must either be accepted or rejected. "The Message to the people of South Africa" of the S.A. Council of Churches is a case in point, although it can fairly be said that this magnificent document came rather ominously late. However, if one asks: Who is proposing to do exactly what? then some possible disillusionment is not to be ruled out. In view of the fact that the so-called South African traditional way of life has shown itself repeatedly capable of callously ostracizing the Christian ministers who have dared to make a stand, one can only expect that the life of the few faithful servants of God will still be made even more unbearable in the years to come. The history of the Christian church abounds with examples to support this claim. There is no doubt that there are some South African Christians who would have the courage to make some supreme act of self-sacrifice. This is inevitable and unavoidable considering the compelling and dynamic message of the Christian faith. For the service which Christ rendered on earth involved the

greatest of all sacrifices. Thus when Paul says "as your servants for Jesus' sake" no one can doubt that the man was capable of sacrificing himself for that very message which he so eloquently proclaimed.

When Dietrich Bonhoeffer was awaiting execution in Hitler's Germany he wrote from prison: "Who stands his ground? Only the man whose ultimate criterion is not in his own reason, his principles, his conscience, his freedom or his virtue, but who is ready to sacrifice all these things when he is called to obedient and responsible action in faith and exclusive allegiance to God. The responsible man seeks to make his whole life a response to the question and call of God." (See Dietrich Bonhoeffer, *LETTERS AND PAPERS FROM PRISON*; S.C.M., 1953.)

The overwhelming majority of Christians in South Africa would probably compromise rather than make a stand. This too is borne out by the history of the church in extremely trying times. Of this one can only take note with a sense of oscillating shame.

There is in South Africa as in any other nominally Christian country the tendency for the congregation to expect their minister not only to take the initiative, but also to do all things that matter by himself. This is quite clearly not what Paul meant when he wrote: "We preach not ourselves . . ." The "We" here surely refers not only to the small group of apostles, but also to the whole Christian community. **Thus "The Message to the people of South Africa" should not be — though it evidently is — the work of only so-called theologians, but rather that of every Christian who dares to call herself or himself a Christian. For when the full meaning and implications of this document are being properly understood and put into practice, the words of Paul "as your servants for Jesus' sake" would become a living reality in South Africa. It is only then that the twin principles of service and sacrifice will find practical application.**

SUFFERING IN SOUTH AFRICA

That there is a lot of unnecessary suffering in South Africa nobody can deny. The tragedy of most of the human suffering is greatly aggravated by the fact that it is largely brought about by deliberate government policy. The needless suffering could

quite clearly be completely prevented in some cases and certainly considerably alleviated in other cases. In a country which is enjoying unprecedented economic prosperity, is almost fully industrialized and has unlimited supplies of raw materials, one would hardly expect so much illiteracy, malnutrition, squalid and poverty-stricken conditions. Yet this is exactly what is happening. This is immeasurably complicated by the fact that the division between the rich and the poor is based on skin colour alone. Thus the fairer a man's skin the more opportunities and better facilities he enjoys; the darker the skin colour the more a man has to bear the full brunt of the suffering. Thus some basic statistics suggest that the life expectancy of a white man is 64.6 (a white woman 70.1) whereas a coloured man has one of 44.8 (a coloured woman 47.8). For Africans such figures cannot be worked out because not all African births are registered. African life expectancy is quite clearly lower than that of coloureds. Only R11.50 is spent annually on an African child at primary school whereas the amount spent on a white child is ten times as high. Furthermore, a mere 13% of the total geographical area is allocated to so-called African Reserves. Yet Africans amount to 68.1% of the population of South Africa. (Of course one can argue that only one-third actually do live in the Reserves, another one-third on white farms outside the Reserves and a further one-third in the urban areas, but even so it does not detract from the obvious injustice of the whole situation). Over 1,300 Africans are arrested every day of the year under the "pass laws". That this iniquitous requirement causes immense and incalculable hardship and suffering can hardly be denied.

Somebody may ask: But why mention all these things when Paul's historical statement, namely: "We preach not ourselves, but Jesus Christ as Lord, and ourselves as your servants for Jesus' sake" is being discussed? The answer is simple. The writer of this article does not believe that there are compartments in our life in which Christ is not Lord. If Christ is Christ then surely He is Christ of every aspect of our private and public life. Therefore, if Christ is to save us in our spiritual life, then He must save us in our political, social and economic life as well. There can be no compartment in our life in which we can put up a signpost with the words

"NO ENTRY TO CHRIST". If the church wants to cease to exist then the surest way to committing its own suicide is to shut Christ out of some compartments of life. People will say and very rightly too that they do not want to have anything to do with such a church.

Economic and social circumstances do affect the spiritual life of people. When white people do not allow a black man to come into their church simply because he is black; when white people occupy another people's country and give them the Bible in exchange; when white people get rich at the expense of black people then one is moved to ask: Did Christ really mean anything to them at all? The very Christ who identified Himself completely with the world and who lived a life of service, suffering and sacrifice is also the Christ of all, irrespective of colour or race. It is this Christ whose message Paul urges us to preach and for whom to make sacrifices.

"INCARNATE DEVILS"

Someone may reply that Christians are expected to concern themselves only with spiritual matters. This argument is often heard in South Africa among Orthodox-Calvinistic Christians in particular and among so-called Evangelical Christians or Fundamental Christians in general. We should, however, note that John says: "God so loved the world . . ." (John 3: 16). The late Dr. W. E. Sangster had something very pertinent to say about this. He very clearly pointed out that some Christians have used the word "world" only in a negative sense, namely the world as organized apart from God. He then went on to write: "They have tended to withdraw from it, to live their own segregated life within it, snatching a soul here and there as they could, but really resigning the world to the Devil.

"But it is God's world. He made it. He sustains it. He redeems it. He hasn't resigned it to the Devil. He is fighting for it. Christians should be fighting with Him." (See: *HOW MUCH ARE YOU SAVED?* Westminster Pamphlet No. 11. By W. E. Sangster.)

It is remarkable to note that the Christians who use the Bible now in defence of racialism use exactly the same verses and the same manner to justify the most unbearable racial discrimination as Christians did to jus-

tify the inhuman slave trade. Albert Barnes said in the United States in 1846: "The defence of slavery from the Bible is to be and will soon be abandoned and men will wonder that any defence of such a system could have been attempted from the Word of God". His prophecy came true. It will also no doubt come true for those unfortunate souls who defend Apartheid with the Bible in the hand. However, Apartheid is still very much

a living reality in South Africa and all the indications are that it may even become worse rather than slackening off.

Richard Baxter, a Presbyterian minister, condemned all slave-traders, who included Christians in those days, as "fitter to be called incarnate devils than Christians". It was a most apt description.

Once again the words of Paul says: "We preach not ourselves, but Christ

Jesus as Lord, and ourselves as your servants for Jesus' sake". Armed with these words, Christians can be assured of the future of the church, but Apartheid can have no future because it is a denial of these very words which form the central citadel of the Christian faith.

(* Mr. E. A. du Plessis is a student of Social Anthropology at the University of Leiden, Holland.)

„VERANTWOORDE REVOLUTIE”

Onder bogenoemde titel het in Desember 1968 by die uitgewers J. H. Kok N.V., Kampen, 'n boek verskyn uit die pen van dr. J. Verkuyl, hoogleraar in die Sendingwetenskap aan die Vrije Universiteit te Amsterdam, en dr. H. G. Schulte Nordholt, hoogleraar in die sosiale wetenskappe aan dieselfde universiteit. Dit dra as ondertitel, **OVER MIDDELEN EN DOELEINDEN IN DE STRIJD OM TRANSFORMATIE VAN SAMENLEVINGEN.**

Myns insiens is hierdie boek vir Suid-Afrika van groot belang, nie alleen omdat in die bydrae van dr. Verkuyl herhaaldelik spesifiek na Suid-Afrika verwys word nie (en selfs die name van Luthuli en Beyers Naudé word genoem!) maar veral ook omdat 'n mens by die lees daarvan diep onder die besef kom dat, al sou daar geen enkele verwysing in voorkom na ons land of na persone wat hulle hier in die stryd om sosiale geregtigheid onderskei het nie, dit in ons situasie inspreek asof met 'n direkte gerigtheid.

Die titel **Verantwoorde Revolusie** is waarskynlik al genoeg om sommige wagters op die apartheidsmure van ons land die aapstuipe te laat kry. En die „status quo”-regs-sinnigheid sal by die aanhoor van die ondertitel, **Over middelen en doeleinden in de strijd om transformatie van samenlevingen**, waarskynlik voel dat die tyd weer aangebreek het om die „brandstapel” wat in ons politieke en kerklike geskryfte so verterend kan vlam, gereed te maak vir nog 'n lekker, vet kettery.

BRANDENDE VRAAGSTUK

Ek wil my veral bepaal by Deel I, geskryf deur dr. Verkuyl. Nie omdat ek Deel II, van dr. Schulte Nordholt, van geringer waarde of minder belang ag nie. Inteendeel, dit is besonder insiggewend vir elkeen wat maar enigsins 'n idee wil kry van wat „revolusie” in werklikheid beteken, nie alleen taalkundig nie, maar ook

as probleemverskynsel in die geskiedenis. Terwyl die bydrae van dr. Verkuyl egter die karakter van 'n evangeliese getuicnis dra, is dié van dr. Schulte Nordholt 'n samevatting van die resultate van 'n werkcollege vir doktoraalstudente wat onder sy leiding gehou is. Die revolusie-verskynsel, ook as probleem waarmee die sosiale wetenskappe tot dusver maar ploeterend besig was, word in sy problematiek ontleed en van verskeie kante as vraagstuk belig. Wat uit die stuk inderdaad duidelik word, word sowel in die **Inleiding** as in die **Conclusie** treffend geformuleer: „De revolusie is een brandend vraagstuk. Ieder die er over spreekt zal zich er aan branden”.

Dit neem egter nie die feit weg dat nadere besinning daarvoor nodig is nie. Wetenskaplike ondersoek in die verband, so lui die konklusie, het nog maar nouliks begin en die wetenskap het nog maar weinig daarvoor te sê. Ook in Uppsala (1968) het die revolusie-probleem nouliks aan die orde gekom. Uit die „vlugtige verkenning” wat in die verslag van die werkcollege sy neerslag gevind het, het dit egter wel geblyk dat die denkpatroon oor die revolusie erg star is — waarmee waarskynlik o.m. bedoel word dat dit sedert die Franse Revolusie steeds deur die beperkte en duidelike betekenis van 'n „gewelddadige en plotselinge verandering van politieke en sosiale strukture” gevorm word. Ook kan gedink word aan die min of meer vaste neiging om die cindstadium van verskillende ingrypende ver-

anderingsprosesse wat hulle in baie dele van die wêreld voltrek, te modelleer na die voorbeeld van een sisteem, terwyl daar nie rekening gehou word met die feit dat by alle trekke van ooreenkoms wat daar mag bestaan, die veranderingsprosesse hulle in verskillende kulture voltrek onder verskillende omstandighede, sodat die loop en selfs die eindresultaat van dergelyke prosesse verskillend kan wees en selfs waarskynlik verskillend sal wees nie.

Omrede van hierdie starheid, so voel prof. Schulte Nordholt en sy werkspan, sou dit nodig kon wees om afstand te neem van die gangbare denkpatroon oor die revolusie-verskynsel, soos dit miskien ook gedoen kan word t.a.v. die heersende magte wat die strukturele veranderinge teëhou. En deur so 'n afstandneming, so lei ek af, moet die woord „revolusie” meer verstaan word in die wyer betekenis wat dit besig is om in die algemene spraakgebruik te kry, nl. 'n ingrypende sosiale struktuurverandering (of dit gesien word as 'n proses wat hom langs die weg van geweld of sonder geweld voltrek, moet dan duidelik gesê word), of snelle „modernisering” (in die sin waarin H. D. Wendland by geleentheid die woord gebruik het). In so 'n wye betekenisinhoud is daar vir 'n „teologie van revolusie” genoeg ruimte om aan kerke die eis te stel dat hulle nie kritiekloos agter die gevestigde magte moet gaan staan of selfs met 'n **aggiornamento** tevrede moet wees nie, maar die wêreld moet wys na strukturele maatskaplike verandering daar waar die bestaande strukture nie ooreenkoms met wat hulle vandag sien as sosiale geregtigheid nie.

Hierdie studiestuk bevat 'n massa interessante materiaal, maar dit kan die leser nouliks bevredig. Die on-

omwonde erkenning dat die probleem waaroor dit handel 'n warm patat is, laat 'n mens egter nie soek na afgerondheid en omynde antwoorde nie. Dit is in elk geval interessant om 'n insae te kry in die wyse waarop 'n verantwoordelike hoogleraar en sy gevorderde studente hulle met die probleem besig hou.

LIG UIT DIE SKRIF

Daar is veel meer helderheid in die wyse waarop prof. Verkuyl oor „verantwoorde revolusie” praat. En ek wil dadelik sê: Wie sy bydrae met 'n Pontiaanse of 'n Treurnichtiaanse vooringenomenheid lees, of met 'n oorhaastige „Entdeckerfreude” dat hier nog 'n „aanhitser tot geweld,” wat hom in die gelede van die behoudende teologie bevind, kleur gaan beken, sal pynlik teleurgesteld wees. Dit gaan vir Verkuyl daarom dat die kerk en die teologie hom oor sy roeping en taak in die wêreld van vandag moet verantwoord. In 'n tyd waarin ons die feitlikheid beleef van die uittog van volke uit toestande van politieke onderhorigheid, sosiale onreg en ekonomiese uitbuiting na 'n nuwe toekoms van mensliker verhoudinge te midde van onmenslike situasies, sou dit van die kerk en die teologie hoogs onverantwoordelik wees om bloot 'n toeskouersrol, of erger nog: die rol van bekrompe sedemeester in diens van die *status quo*, te vervul. En verantwoord is iets anders as om aan die gebeurtenisse self een of ander teologiese duiding te gee. Dit gaan om die roeping van die kerk in die wêreld waarin hy hom bevind.

In hierdie wêreld word daar ont-saglik veel gely. Daar is politieke en maatskaplike en ekonomiese stelsels van onreg wat miljoene mense in baie wêrelddele nog steeds hou in die knegskap van ellende en regteloosheid. Die kerk bevind hom te midde van die stryd om reg en om bevryding, of hy sien ook die letargie van vele wat uit hulleself geen krag kan voortbring tot hoop en verwagting nie.

Wat glo die kerk aangaande die wêreld en hoe sien hy sy taak in die wêreld? Daaroor moet hy hom verantwoord. Die vraag na geregtigheid in die samelewing, nasionaal, internasionaal en mondiaal, dring hom aan die kerk op. Hy kan dit eenmaal nie ontwyk om tot selfrekenskap te kom oor waar hy staan, oor watter weg hy moet aanwys en oor wat van Godsweë in hierdie wêreld van hom verwag word nie. En juis om nie soos 'n vreemdeling in hierdie wêreld te

staan nie, sal hy hom moet terugtrek om aandagtig te luister na wat die „vreemde” Woord van God, wat dit in tye van oorlog en gevangenskap lig kan laat word in tronkselle en in nagte van honger en ellende, in hierdie tyd aan hom wil sê.

Dan sal die kerk, wat hom dikwels so ongevaarlik vreemd in hierdie wêreld gedra en dan juis ook so voortrefflik harmonies in die skema van hierdie wêreld inpas, opnuut ontdek wie God is en wat sy bedoeling met sy wêreld is. Hy, die Bevryder van Israel uit die slawehuis, is nie die God van die *status quo* nie! Hy lei sy volk uit hulle ekonomiese en politieke en geestelike slawerny en gaan hulle voor op die weg na 'n nuwe toekoms. Voor die aangesig van **hierdie God** mag sy volk geen ander gode hê nie. Sy heerskappy wil Hy uitoefen oor 'n bevryde volk wat leef van sy barmhartigheid en geregtigheid en wat dan ook in alle verhoudings waarin dit leef, gestalte gee aan hierdie barmhartigheid en geregtigheid. In Israel het Hy geopenbaar wat sy bedoeling met die wêreld en met die menselewe is: Hy wil sy ryk op aarde oprig waarin geregtigheid „breeduit” woon. **Die aardse lewe moet 'n gemeenskap wees waarin God God is en die mense mense is, en waarin God en die mense saamwoon in geregtigheid en liefde in 'n onverbreekbare bondgenootskap.** Van hierdie bedoeling getuig die kritiek van Israel se profete op die ongeregtighede in die volkslewe. Ter wille daarvan het Jesus in die wêreld gekom, is Hy gekruisig en het Hy opgestaan uit die dood. En ons verwagting van sy weerkoms is gerig op „nuwe hemele en 'n nuwe aarde waarin geregtigheid woon” (2 Petr. 3: 13). Hierdie geloof en hierdie verwagting moet vir die kerk, deur alle eeue en tot vandag, sy houding bepaal en sy roeping en taak vir hom aandui. Hy moet leef en handel en getuig vanuit die toekoms van God. Sy verwagting laat hom inderdaad wag, op Gods tyd; maar dit laat hom ook haas, want in hierdie wêreld van onreg en ongeregtigheid is dit alleen wáár, dat God sy koninkryk van geregtigheid hier oprig.

„TEOLOGIE VAN REVOLUSIE”

In sommige kerklike kringe word daar teenswoordig aangedring op 'n „teologie van revolusie”. Wat daarmee bedoel word, hang natuurlik af van die betekenis wat daar geheg word aan die begrip „revolusie”. In die verantwoordelike teologiese taalge-

bruik, so meen Verkuyl, moet hierdie uitdrukking liever vermy word, omdat dit aanleiding kan gee tot misverstand. Want dit is ontenseglik waar dat daar in ons huidige wêreld ook 'n **ideologie van revolusie**, in die sin van geweldpleging en bloedvergieting as die enigste weg om strukture te verander, besig is om te groei. Die kerk en die teologie het egter ook met hierdie ideologie, soos met alle ander onchristelike ideologieë, niks gemeen nie. Wat nodig is, is om na die Bybel te luister en daarvolgens te handel. Alles wat nodig is vir 'n transformasie van hierdie wêreld waarvan die gelaat oortrek is met die afsigtelike swere van onreg en ongeregtigheid, is daarin voor hande. Die **Woord** moet geglo, d.w.s. gehoor en gedoen word. Ons verwesenlik wel nie die nuwe aarde waarin geregtigheid woon nie, maar niks is meer in stryd met die gees van die apostels en die profete as wanneer daar geen verbinding gelê word tussen die verwagting en ons lewe hier en nou nie. So 'n verbinding bring die daad van antisipasie tevoorskyn waarmee ons ook in die inrigting van hierdie aardse lewe die Dag van die Here tegemoet lééf. Wat die wêreld in ons tyd dus van die kerk en die teologie nodig het, is niks anders as wat dit deur die eeue heen nog altyd nodig gehad het nie, nl. die lig op sy pad vanuit die grondwaarhede van die Bybel en van die Christelike geloof. Dit is waarvoor dr. Verkuyl pleit. Dit gaan vir hom om 'n „**teologie van transformasie**” waardeur die weg gewys sal word om die aardse lewe in te rig vanuit die Bybelse toekomsverwagting. En om dié rede spreek dit in die Suid-Afrikaanse situasie in asof met 'n direkte gerigtheid.

Dat daar in ons land 'n stelsel van onreg in swang is wat onmoontlik kan voortduur, en dat daar verandering moét kom, word deur meer en meer mense onder ons steeds duideliker ingesien. En uitentreure moet dit deur die Christelike getuieis herhaal word dat, wat werklik in Suid-Afrika nodig is, 'n evaluasie van ons situasie is in die lig van die Bybelse heilsgeloof en heilsverwagting. Kan daar maar by benadering sprake wees van enige verbinding tussen God se „nuwe aarde” waarin geregtigheid woon en die feit dat miljoene nie-blankes vanweë die apartheidsbeseitenheid van die blankes en hulle angsvallige selfbehoudspolitiek, vreemdelinge is in hulle vaderland? God wat dáarin God is dat Hy bevryding

skenk en uitlei uit die „slawerny” van ekonomiese en politieke en geestelike gebondenheid, is tog nie slegs die „God van die Afrikaner” nie? Ook die Bantoes en die Kleurlinge en die Indiërs deel tog in sy beloftes, en hulle moét daarin kan deel nie slegs op die wyse van vrome toesegginge nie maar ook op die wyse van lewe in ’n gemeenskap waarin die reg bewaar en geregtigheid gedoen word. Dit behoort, vanuit ’n Christelike oogpunt gesien, die opset van ons landspolitek te wees. En dit is die dure roeping van die kerk om hierdie lig vanuit Gods toekoms te laat val op die pad van die staat in Suid-Afrika.

DIE STAAT?

Dat dr. Verkuyl nie duidelik aandui wat die plek en verantwoordelikheid van die staat in hierdie „teologie van transformasie” is nie, lyk vir my na ’n wesenlike leemte. Dit hang waarskynlik saam met sy uitgesproke afkeer van alle „natuurlike teologie” of „ordeninge-teologie” en „restourasie teologie”. Tog staan ons hier voor wat ook in die Christelike teologie as ’n onontwykbare noodsaaklikheid gesien moet word. Die transformasie van ’n bepaalde samelewingstruktuur kan nie geskied op die wyse soos Verkuyl dit voor oë het, nl. deur gehoorsaamheid aan die gebooe en beloftes van God, deur bekering dus, sonder dat die staat daarin as instansie nommer één gesien word nie. Die kerk is nie so geïnteresseerd daarin as die politieke party dat ’n owerheid wat nie goed regeer, vervang sal word nie. Vir die kerk gaan dit daarom dat ’n owerheid wat onreg doen, hom sal bekeer.

Die stáát is die instansie wat daarvoor verantwoordelik is dat die samelewing ingerig en georden sal word op die grondslae van die liefde en die geregtigheid. Die kerk het daarom ook ’n bepaalde adres waaraan hy sy profetiese getuienis rig, waarvoor hy die voorbeeld vind in die optrede van Israel se profete. Met sy geloof aan Gods bedoeling met die wêreld en sy getuienis vanuit die waarheid van die Godsryk wat in Jesus gekom het en by sy weerkoms in heerlijkheid geopenbaar sal word, staan hy teenoor die staat. Hierdie Bybelse grondwaarhede moet nie alleen die stoot gee aan ’n teologie van transformasie nie, maar dit moet ook oorgaan in ’n daad van transformasie. En daarvan is die staat die subjek by uitnemendheid.

HOUDING VAN DIE KERK

Daarom is dit so noodsaaklik dat die kerk met sy getuienis vanuit die

Godsopenbaring teenoor die staat sterk en suiwer sal staan. Hy versaa sy roeping as hy hom op quasi-Bybelse gronde verset teen elke vernuwing van die samelewing in situasies waar die onreg tot ’n breekpunt gelei het en reeds dringend roep om verandering. Dr. Verkuyl praat in hierdie verband van die **teologie en praktyk van die contra-revolusie**, en verwys na lande soos Rusland, Sjina en Kuba as skrynende illustrasies van watter magte dit oorneem as die kerk dit as sy hoogste roeping beskou om as verdediger en behoeder van die in onreg versterkte maatskaplike struktuur op te tree. Ten nouste hang hiermee saam die **teologie en praktyk van die status quo**. Of alles en almal wat dr. Verkuyl hierby betrek wél hier hoort, betwyfel ek. Selfs is ek van mening dat ’n „contrarevolutionêre” en ’n „status quo”-teologie eintlik nie van mekaar onderskei kan word nie. Wat egter buite alle twyfel staan, is dat ’n pseudo-Bybelse regsinigheid wat hom op sogenaamde „skeppingsordeninge” beroep „om hand- en spandiensten te verlenen aan de status quo van een systeem van politieke en ekonomiese exploitasie”, ’n skandelijke misbruik is van die Skrif. En tereg verwys die skrywer hier pertinent na Suid-Afrika. So lank as wat invloedryke kerke hier vir die ideologie van apartheid sy teologiese onderbou voorsien deur te leer dat „die beleid van eiesoortige ontwikkeling” in ooreenstemming is met skeppingsordeninge wat tot in ewigheid gerespekteer moet word, sal die verandering van die politieke en maatskaplike struktuur wat daar in ons land moet (en gaan!) kom, nie geskied langs die weg van ’n vernuwing van binne uit, van ’n vreugdevolle en gelowige antispasie op die „nuwe aarde” waarin daar geregtigheid woon nie. Ons kerke besef eenvoudig nie hoe groot hulle verantwoordelikheid in hierdie opsig is nie. ’n Geleentheid wat hulle in ’n beslissende tydsgewrig in die geskiedenis van ons land gebied word, nl. om die beëindiging van diskriminasie teenoor die nie-blankes van ons land (wat in elk geval binne afsienbare tyd iets van die verlede gaan wees) tot ’n belewenis vanuit die Evangelie te maak, laat hulle deur die vingers gly. Hoeveel leed en smart sal ons land gespaar bly as ons kerke maar wil uitbreek uit die bande van hulle skeppingsordeninge-teologie om heroute van die Godsryk te word!

GODSDIENS EN POLITIEK

’n Derde fatale reaksie van die kerk en die teologie op die uitdaging van die tyd wat dr. Verkuyl noem, is die **houding van die piëtisme ten opsigte van die transformasie van die samelewing**, waardeur die brandende vraagstukke van die dag ontwyk word. Dat dit as ’n waarskuwing ook aan ons adres gehoor moet word, ly geen twyfel nie. Wat hier met „piëtisme” bedoel word, is daardie wyse van geloof en godsdienstbeoefening wat hom so uitsluitend tot die siel en tot die redding van die enkele mens beperk, dat dit geen aandag oorgehou het vir die wêreldse strukture waarbinne die mens sy lewe leef nie. In Suid-Afrika skyn dit soms skering en inslag van ons godsdienstigheid te wees dat die kerk hom met siele moet bemoei en nie met die politiek nie, al pas ons dit ook toe met ’n sonderlinge inkonsekwentheid.

Die vraag: Watter politiek? is hier eintlik van bepalende betekenis. Die feit bv. dat dr. A. P. Treurnicht uit sy redakteurstoel van **Die Kerkbode** kon oorwip in dié van ’n politieke dagblad, het sy assessorskap van die Algemene Sinode van die Ned. Geref. Kerk hoegenaamd in die gedrang gebring nie. Dit was eintlik ’n vanselfsprekende oorgang wat geskied het onder klaarblyklike byval van kerk-en-volk. Maar die Eerste Minister kan net so goed reken op die algemene instemming van kerk-en-volk as hy predikante wat ’n politieke getuienis laat hoor (nie ten dienste van ’n party nie, maar aan die owerheid!) terugboender preekstoel toe om die evangelie te gaan verkondig!

As die kerk in ons land werklik ’n sinvolle rol wil vervul as medewerker van God in die verwesenliking van sy bedoeling ook met ons totale volksbestaan, sal hy hieroor duidelikheid moet kry en eerlikheid aan die dag lê. En watter een van die twee prioriteit moet geniet, duidelikheid of eerlikheid, is moeilik uit te maak. Die tweede is so voorwaardelik vir die eerste as die eerste vir die tweede.

Maar intussen lyk dit wel of ons onder ’n spel van innig-vrome godsdienstigheid en kerklikheid, van bekommernis oor siele en sorg om die sedes, die grootste geleentheid van die kerk in die geskiedenis van Suid-Afrika mag verspeel.

SONDE

In samehang hiermee is een van ’n aantal belangrike dogmatiese temas wat, volgens dr. Verkuyl, nader uitgewerk behoort te word, die sonde-

leer. Moet dit slegs individueel, selfs slegs tot die intra-psigiese beperk, opgevat word? Leer die Bybel nie dat die oordeel van God ook val op kollektiewe, strukturele sondes nie? „Er zijn machtsstructuren waarin de ongerechtigheid gestalte aanneemt, waarin het racisme gehuisvest is, waarin de onbarmhartigheid geïnvesteerd is”. En dit doen pynlik aan om hom ook weer in hierdie verband spesifiek na Suid-Afrika te hoor verwys; maar omdat dit so onloënbaar waar is, vir ons des te meer rede om ons nie doof te hou vir die waarskuwing wat daarin vervat is nie: „In de debatten over het rassenvraagstuk op de Gereformeerde Oecumenische Synode in Lunteren (1968) was een van de stereotiepe weerstanden tegen het met name noemen van geïnstitutionaliseerd racisme in de apartheids-politiek, dat de zonde in het hart der mensen moet aangewezen worden en niet in bestaande structuren. Men kan blijkbaar het gezag van Gods Woord zeer onderstrepen en zich tegelijk aan het gezag van dat Woord onttrekken, zodra dat Woord over structuren spreekt”.

„TEOKRATIESE NOODSITUASIE”

Ek moet my bespreking van hierdie boek en sy direkte toepaslikheid op Suid-Afrika hier afsluit, maar kan dit nie doen sonder om kortliks nog iets te sê oor wat die skrywer sien as die **middele** in die stryd om transformasie nie.

Die wesenlike leemte is hier natuurlik weer dat hy nie die getuienis van die kerk teenoor die staat vooropstel nie. Hoe belangrik dit is, sou m.i. selfs ook aan die voorbeeld van Suid-Afrika geïllustreer kon word. Want wat ons situasie betref, moet dit feitlik as aksiomaties aanvaar word dat 'n onbevange kritiese houding van m.n. die Afrikaans-sprekende kerke t.o.v. die owerheid, 'n radikale verandering van die politieke koers sou kon meebring.

Daarmee wil ek geensins die rol wat die Suid-Afrikaanse Raad van Kerke kan speel in die transformasie van ons samelewing, onderskat nie. Dit is m.i. nog nie te laat om in Suid-Afrika die weg van 'n cendragtige kerklike getuienis teenoor die owerheid te volg nie. Wat dit betref, is dit miskien nodig om hierdie liggaam te bemoedig met die herinnering dat die feit dat die drie Afrikaans-Hollandse kerke nie daarby ingeskakel is nie, wesenlik niks afdoen aan die gesag waarmee hy tot die owerheid kan

sprek nie. Wel moet vir die drie Afrikaans-Hollandse kerke die deur tot lidmaatskap nie slegs wyd oop bly nie, maar hulle moet ook nie met rus gelaat word nie. Daar moet onophoudelik by hulle aangedring word om hulle plek daar in te neem.

Dit ly geen twyfel nie dat die afwesigheid in ons land van 'n kerk wat belydend teenoor die owerheid staan, veroorsaak het wat ek wil noem 'n teokratiese noodsituasie.

Die Suid-Afrikaanse Raad van Kerke het in hierdie opsig óók 'n geleentheid wat hy nie mag verspeel nie. Dit is eerstens vir hom nodig om sy eie organisasie so te beplan dat hy oor 'n doeltreffende spreekorgaan sal beskik sodat die stem van die Kerk steeds tydig en betyds gehoor sal word. Tweedens moet hy nie terugdeins vir die feitlikheid waarmee sy posisie as belydende kerk in Suid-Afrika onontwykbaar vir hom aangedui is nie. En derdens moet hy teenoor dié kerke wat òf deur 'n houding van afsydigheid òf deur openlike opposisie teen sy getuienis, sy posisie as belydende kerk betwyfel of ontken, met 'n beroep op Gods Woord en die waarhede van die algemene Christelike geloof die aanspraak handhaaf dat dit nie hý is wat buite staan wat betref die plek wat die kerk van Godsweë in ons volkslewe moet inneem nie, maar hulle.

DOEL EN MIDDELE

In die cendragtige en volhardende getuienis van die kerk teenoor die staat, sien ek tog meer as wat dr. Verkuyl „verklaringe” oor rasse-, ekonomiese, sosiale en politieke geregtigheid noem, en wat hy tereg as onvoldoende beskou. Die getuienis vanuit

die Woord van God is meer as 'n verklaring. Vir dr. Verkuyl gaan dit natuurlik dááror dat daar nie slegs gepraat sal word nie, maar dat daar ook ernstig nagedink sal word oor die middele wat aangewend moet word in die stryd om transformasie van die samelewing — en hy het volkome gelyk. Dit is dan ook in ooreenstemming met sy verantwoordelikheid as professor in die teologie aan 'n universiteit waarvandaan Christelike leiers uitgestuur word as hy beklemtoon dat dié middele suiwer moet wees. Die doel heilig nie die middele nie. „Men kan met immorele middelen geen zuivere doeleinden bereiken”. Hier sou ek dus die kragtige en cendragtige getuienis van die kerk teenoor die staat wil vooropstel.

Die middele wat dr. Verkuyl noem, wil ek slegs nog aanstip sonder om verder daarop in te gaan: 1. Politieke, sosiale en ekonomiese vorming (waarmee bedoel word opvoeding van volwassenes). 2. Uitbuiting van die middele van die parlementêre demokrasie. 3. Opposisie deur woord en geskrif, petisie en demonstrasie. 4. Geweldlose verzet (dus „die soort van ding wat Martin Luther in Amerika gedoen het”, soos ons Eerste Minister dit gestel het). 5. Algehele of gedeeltelike staking. 6. Die gewelddadige revolusie as laaste middel.

Dit sou m.i. van groot waarde wees as temas wat in hierdie boek aan die orde kom, bv. deur studiegroepe van die Christelike Instituut nader bestudeer en uitgewerk sal word met die oog op doeltreffende Christelike getuienis en optrede in die stryd om transformasie van die Suid-Afrikaanse samelewing.

BEN ENGELBRECHT.

QUESTIONS PUT TO THE CHURCHES

Sermon on Matth. 16: 1-4 (Christian Council, Lesotho, 1st March, 1969)

DR. MARIE-LOUISE MARTIN

This New Testament passage speaks about a sign — *semeion* in Greek. A sign in the New Testament context has a double object: first, to announce what is to take place (in this respect it often constitutes an anticipation of the world to come) and secondly, to proclaim or to reveal Jesus as the Messiah by drawing attention to him. The sign shows that

God is at work in Jesus and through him.

Now the enemies of Jesus, the pious and law-abiding Pharisees as well as the liberal Sadducees, came to test him and to require a sign from heaven which would unmistakably prove that he was the expected Redeemer. They wanted something over and above his ordinary miracles and words. After

all, had not the prophets also wrought miracles and even raised the dead and preached? What was therefore new about this Jesus of Nazareth? Outwardly, nothing!

TIME FULFILLED

And yet, everything was new. The time had been fulfilled. God was in Jesus reconciling the world to himself. Salvation had come, the kingdom was present. But not in the spectacular way people at that time expected. It has not dawned upon them in terms of the expected freedom from the colonial yoke of Rome, or in terms of prosperity and a paradise on earth. Rather freedom was there for those who repented and surrendered themselves unconditionally to this Jesus who was a simple preacher and healer and was on his way to suffer and to die. But the enemies of Jesus wanted redemption on their own terms without faith and repentance and were refused the sign they required. They were blind to the reality of God at work in Jesus. "When it is evening you say, it will be fair weather, for the sky is red. And in the morning: it will be stormy today, for the sky is red and threatening. You know how to interpret the appearance of the sky, but you cannot interpret the signs of the times", Jesus reproached them.

They were "an evil and adulterous generation". This means a generation which had turned away from the living God and betrayed his love. For such a generation all signs would be in vain. The only sign which would be given was that of Jonah. Through the preaching of Jonah, the pagan and evil Niniveh repented. One of the implications of this saying of Jesus is therefore that the faith of pagans and of outsiders will confound the pious Jews. And the other is this: as Jonah was three days in the whale's belly, so Jesus will die and rise on the third day. And this will utterly confound the Jews, the Pharisees and the Sadducees alike. For a suffering and dying Messiah was for them a contradiction in terms.

After having said this, Jesus left them and departed.

* * * *

This passage poses a few serious questions for us. Do we understand the signs of our time? Are we aware of how God is at work today in the events of our time and in the stirrings within the Church? Or are we blind and deaf in all our piety like the Pharisees, or in our liberalism like the

Sadducees? Yes, Christ is present in the events of our time, working out both judgment and salvation. Are the Churches in Lesotho able to see and interpret the signs, or are they blind like the Pharisees and Sadducees?

ECUMENISM

The first sign of our time which I want to mention is ecumenism — a thing of which we knew very little in this country even ten years ago. Ecumenism may, however, be a mere word and a cloak under which we pursue all the more our denominational and sectarian aims, objects and policies. If it is that, then ecumenism is a hypocrisy. There is, fortunately, widespread opposition against such surface-ecumenism, as I would call it. This opposition is found especially among the young generation of intellectuals throughout Southern Africa. Why are we still hiving off in small denominational groups to worship and celebrate Holy Eucharist, they ask? Why can't we do things in common without fear that one denomination will lord it over the others? True ecumenism is alive where we do not try to retain something which is more important to us or equally important than what we have in common through Christ. True ecumenism becomes alive where each — I repeat — each denomination is willing to surrender something, even its own life in order to find true life. The world is crying out for such real, sacrificial unity, and not some paper-unity. Are we willing to open our eyes to this sign of our time and to repent and begin on a new and truly ecumenical basis which will then have effects right down to the grass-roots and eventually remove all suspicion and fear between denominations still bedeviling ecumenism today?

THE INDEPENDENT CHURCH MOVEMENT

A second sign of our time is the tremendous rise of the independent church-movement, counting already millions of members in Southern Africa, let alone Central, East and West-Africa. It is not good enough (and far from being a Christian attitude) if we dub them apostates, half-pagans, break-away sects, etc. and say: let them come back to us, the established churches. They will not. They have in many cases developed ways of worship and found means of meeting the deepest needs of men in times of

crisis that differ too much from those of established churches. Have we ever given a thought to the fact that many of our church-members seek their help in times of distress at one of the many "Zions" or "Jerusalems"? Instead of being indignant, why do we not ask ourselves if it is not perhaps the Lord Himself who is active in these independent movements and showing us where we have neglected vital aspects of the Christian faith through a too onesided western approach? Must we not repent by taking their quests seriously and entering into a dialogue with them? We have to make the first step, because they still suffer from a feeling of being despised. But certainly, the tremendous rise of this movement in Africa is one of the signs of our time.

IDEOLOGIES

A third sign of our time is the strong impact of ideologies in the whole world, ideologies which call themselves Christian or anti-Christian (among the latter e.g. militant communism). They are all dangerous. A well-known New Testament scholar said to me some time ago that all "isms" and ideologies come from the devil and are infected by the powers of darkness and evil. I think that this basically is true. All too often they develop into a pseudo-gospel, and I would like to draw your attention to the Message published some few months ago by the S.A. Council of Churches. Now, ideologies know no boundaries of country and race; no passports and visas are required from them. Are we aware of the possibility of such ideologies spreading among us, and of ill-practices springing from them that could do untold harm to Lesotho and divide our people even more? To keep quiet in order to maintain the structures of our churches will not help us. For Christ has said: "Whoever would save his life will lose it, but whoever loses his life for my sake will find it".

SECULARISATION

The fourth and last sign of our time that I want to mention is the tremendous process of secularisation that has set in and the crisis of authority that is so obvious in the student unrest all over the world. People no longer believe in authority because a certain authority happens to be there. They question all the structures, and they question the structures as well as the

language and attitude of the Church. How many prayers and sermons are still expressed in the language of Canaan, or in the language of the 19th century? How many problems are ignored, and the church takes little note of the tremendous social, political and scientific changes within the last twenty five years. It would be wrong to call this secularisation process and the whole crisis of authority simply sin and apostasy. There is of course sin and apostasy in it, as we find sin and apostasy within the Church. In some quarters the Church has been so much out of touch with real life that it has for all practical purposes denied the incarnation of Christ, which is

God's self-identification with man as he lives here and now, and not some twenty, fifty or hundred years ago. The gospel must be lived and spelled out for present-day man with his needs and problems. Insistence on mere authority (what we call in Sotho the "Borena-attitude") will only stifle opposition. God is challenging us tremendously through this sign of our time. The problems of a new age and a new man in this secular age have to be dealt with together in this part of the world, with a new awareness of African culture and its forms of expression in religion and community life.

I have mentioned briefly four signs of our time only. There are others. The question is: do we see and take them seriously? Or do we find it more convenient to close our eyes? If so, we shall not escape judgment. Jesus may leave us and depart, as we read in the last verse of our Scripture portion. Yet God's gracious call still goes out: "Cast away from you all the transgressions which you have committed against me, and get yourselves a new heart and a new spirit. Why will you die, o house of Israel — o Church of the Lord? For I have no pleasure in the death of anyone, says the Lord God. So turn and live!" (Ez. 18: 31f).

Die Kerk Buite Suid-Afrika

— PROF. B. B. KEET

POUS PAULUS VI ANNEKSEER DIE JAAR 1969

„Persbureau der Nederlandse Hervormde Kerk” noem hom die „blunderaar van het jaar”, en begin dan ’n aanhaling uit ’n artikel van Joost van Roon, *Het Vrije Volk*, 31 Desember 1968, met hierdie woorde: As die klok vanaand 12 uur slaan, besef u dan onmiddellik dat Wêreldvrede-dag aangebreek het? Die Pous self het dit gesê. Kater of geen kater nie, 1 Januarie is deur hom bestem as „dag van vrede”. En dan gaan die berig voort: Miljoene Katolieke werk mee, het die Vatikaan gemeld. En ses regerings in Latyns-Amerika (u weet wel dié fyn-katolieke diktature) het terug laat weet dat hulle reeds ’n dag van besinning daarvan gemaak het.

Wees dus môre ekstra lief vir mekaar. As oorlogvoerende regeringe maar net na die kalender wil kyk. Miskien sal hulle die Kers-stilstand nog ’n bietjie verder wil rek — dit kan dan minder dodes beteken. In alle geval, dat Paulus VI geen vrede op die slagvelde kan bring nie verwonder niemand nie; maar wel wêk dit die hoogste verbasing (en magtelose woede!) dat hy in ’n klassieke drama soos dié in Florence geen vrede bring nie.

Wat het die sagmoedige vegter-pastoor Mazzi in die Florentynse wyk Isolotto anders gedoen as om jaar in en jaar uit solidêr met die armes en werkloos in sy parogie te verkeer? En wat het die Pous gedoen? Hy het skandelik nagelaat om hierdie klein maar groot man in beskerming te neem teen die nougesette kardinaal Florit wat hom in Desember uitge-rangeer het, weggee het soos ’n lastige vlieg. Die Pous het dan Mazzi laat oorlewer en die kant van die verblinde Florit gekies — ’n man wat net soos hy self ly aan die neuroses van die formele, deur dik en dun gesagdraer.

Hier stem volkome ooreen wat hierdie pous aan vyfduisend arbeiders in die staalfabrieke van Taranto gesê

het, tydens die viering van die mis in die Kersnag: „U vertoef in ’n wêreld wat aan ons, mense van die kerk, volkome vreemd is”. Inderdaad, die wêreld van pastoor Mazzi is aan Paulus VI, man van die kerk, volkome vreemd. Hoe dit ook sy, in Europa word die Vatikaan steeds ongeloofwaardiger. Die Romeinse hoofbestuur het, dank sy die onderdanige geloof van massas, eenvoudige mense, homself gehandhaaf. Maar priesters weet beter. Steeds meer priesters en leke weet nou ook beter. Die jaar 1968 het dit, tot groeiende verrassing, aan die lig gebring . . . Daar is geen hoop solank as die biskop van Rome simbool en brandpunt van die hierargie bly nie — die instituut wat nou verouder is.

MARTIN LUTHER KING VEREER

Ecumenical Press Service maak melding van verskeie onderneminge ter ere van die man wat deur ’n sluipmoordenaar om die lewe gebring is, die man wat ’n pryswenner was in die Nobel Vredesstiging en wie se ideale op hierdie wyse erkenning en bevordering verkry. ’n Sentrum as gedenkteken word opgerig in Atlanta, en op wat sy veertigste verjaarsdag (15 Jan.) sou gewees het, het mev. King aangekondig dat ’n „centre of hope” op verskeie plekke opgerig gaan word, saam met ’n aandenkingspark waarin die liggaam van Dr. King sal rus. Dan word daar ook ’n instituut vir Passiewe Sosiale Verandering en ’n Instituut vir Afro-Amerikaanse Studies, met biblioteek en argiewe, gestig. Stigtingsgeskenke, gemeenskaplike en private geskenke word verwag om die sentrum te finansier om die koste te dek, wat geskat word op nagenoeg 40 miljoen dollar.

Op dieselfde dag is grond in Atlanta aangekoop teen 2.5 miljoen dollar vir ’n Martin Luther King dorp met 192 eenhede vir matige en lae inkomste families. In hierdie dorp sal die Southern Leadership Conference, waarvan Dr. King leier was, sy hoofkwartier hê.

In Washington het Senator Edward W. Brooke van Massachusetts ’n wetsontwerp voorgestel om 15 Janu-

arie van elke jaar te noem „Martin Luther King Day”. Die wetsontwerp is ook in die Huis van Verteenwoordigers voorgestel. Mev King het na Indië gegaan om die Nehru-prys vir

Internasionale Verstandhouding te ontvang, deur die Indiese regering aan haar man toegeken. In Londen sal sy op 16 Maart op uitnodiging 'n preek lewer in die St. Paul's-katedraal

(Anglikaans). Haar oorlede man het hier presies vier jaar gelede gepreek toe hy op weg was na Oslo om die Nobel Vredesprys te ontvang.

Letters—Briewe

LASTIGE VRAE

Ds. Nico van Loggerenberg, Posbus 346, Benoni.

Die saaklike vrae en opmerkinge van mnr. V. G. Davies van Kaapstad aan die redakteur van *Pro Veritate*, in die jongste twee uitgawes, was beslis baie lastig en die redakteur kon sy opsigtelike verleentheid nie verberg nie, daarom 'n verdere paar opmerkinge as deelname aan die gesprek.

1. Die verleentheid van die redakteur was enersyds 'n openbaring en andersyds 'n tipiese kenmerk van die moderne liberalisme. Dit was 'n openbaring omdat *Pro Veritate* jare gelede gestig is om beter „begrip” oor beleidsake en onderlinge verskille te bevorder. *Pro Veritate* het dan ook al die jare van sy bestaan „apartheid” konsekwent betwis en nou moet die redakteur rondborstig erken: „We have indeed no clear-cut answer as to what the alternative to apartheid should be”. Hoe pateties klink dit nie! Watter beter begrip kan *Pro Veritate* bring as hy self nie weet wat hy wil bevorder nie?

Die verleentheid is ook 'n tipiese kenmerk van die liberalisme. Hierdie meerderwaardige geestesrigting wil die politieke, godsdienstige en sosiaal-maatskaplike ordes en atmosfeer in die wêreld deur agitاسies, proteste, die vermenigvuldiging van organisاسies en strydgeskrifte, hervorm en omvorm, en as jy hulle vra: Wat is die alternatief wat julle voorstel en wat gaan die eindresultaat daarvan wees? Dan kom die patetiese antwoord: „We have indeed no clear-cut answer”. As *Pro Veritate* dan geen „clear-cut” antwoord het nie, waarom betoog hy dan met „niks” teen 'n staatkundige be-

leid? Is dit werklik so, of durf *Pro Veritate* nie sy „clear-cut” alternatief, volkome rasse-integrاسie, bekend maak nie?

2. Voorts sou ek graag wou weet: Waarom kleef *Pro Veritate* so krampagtig aan die misleidende begrip „apartheid” vas, terwyl Suid-Afrika, kerklik en staatkundig, lankal die begrip laat vaar het? Is dit miskien omdat die misleidende begrip die negatiewe verbeelding van die liberalisties denkende mensheid in die wêreld aangegryp het? Of is dit miskien omdat die geldbronne van *Pro Veritate* en die Christelike Instituut dit verwag? *Pro Veritate* is in die lewe geroep om die waarheid te dien en beter „begrip” te bevorder en tog bly hy vaskleef aan 'n misleidende en afgeskryfte begrip. Waarom leef *Pro Veritate* so agter die tyd?

Die begrip „apartheid” is misleidend omdat dit 'n statiese voorstelling van die werklik dinamiese beleid van differensiasie en eiesoortigheid is. Dit is ook misleidend omdat „apartheid” 'n negatiewe begrip is, terwyl die samelewingsorde positief Christelik is. Die begrip „apartheid” is Christelik aanvegbaar, terwyl die beleid van differensiasie en eiesoortigheid Christelik-Skriftuurlik onaanvegbaar is. Nou is my vraag dit: Watter begripsverheldering wil *Pro Veritate* nou bevorder, wanneer hy halsstarrig met negatiewe en verouderde begrippe hom besig hou?

Skrywer is persoonlik oortuig dat *Pro Veritate* en die Christelike Instituut hul strategie nie durf aanpas by die positiewe ontwikkeling van die samelewing in Suid-Afrika nie, want dan verval hul bestaansreg en sal die wêreld daarvan kennis neem dat selfs die separatistiese godsdienste hulle verwerp.

* * * *

Lees asseblief ons inleidingsartikel.

Mnr. Davies het blykbaar van ons verwag om 'n uitgewerkte alternatiewe politieke beleid teenoor die beleid van apartheid te stel, soos duidelik blyk uit sy brief wat in ons Januarie-uitgawe verskyn het. En juis wat dit betref, het ons dit nog altyd duidelik gestel dat daar in die lig van wat ons as die alternatief vir apartheid beskou, nie so presies en omlynd vooruit gesien kan word hoe ons samelewingspatroon daar sal uitsien as

ons die idee van apartheid sou laat vaar nie. Ons voel ook hoegenaamd nie dat ons daarmee in 'n hoek van stomme verleentheid staan nie. Dit gaan vir ons tog basies dáárom dat apartheid as geestelike grondslag vir die inrigting van ons samelewing, vanuit 'n Christelike oogpunt gesien, klaarblyklik verwerplik is. En ons pleit steeds daarvoor dat daar 'n ander, of liever: 'n CHRISTELIK-GELDIGE geestelike grondslag vir ons landspolitiek gevind moet word. Dit is, volgens ons oortuiging, die op die evangelie van die versoening in Christus gebaseerde geloof dat alle mense in Suid-Afrika, ongeag hulle ras of kleur, as 'n gemeenskap kan SAAM lewe. Des te meer moet dit die uitgangspunt van ons politiek wees omdat ons in alle feitlikheid hier tog saam IS. Hoe die samelewing in ons land daar sal uitsien as DIT die grondslag is waarop ons dit inrig en die doel waarop ons afstuur — en daarvoor was ons nog nooit ontwykend nie — is nie vooraf in 'n uitgewerkte patroon vas te lê nie. Daarvoor kan daar uiteraard ook eers sinvol gepraat word as ons bereid is om ons op hierdie gelóófsbasis te stel en ons politiek daarop te bou. Soveel is ten minste seker dat talle gedrogtelike apartheidswette (die rasseklassifikasiewet, om maar een te noem) wat „kankers in ons volkslewe” is, daaruit verwyder en weggeslinger sal word.

Ons is in elk geval dankbaar om te verneem dat ds. Van Loggerenberg apartheid ook as aanvegbaar beskou. Miskien is ons tog nie so uit die pas met ons woordgebruik soos wat ds. Van Loggerenberg wil voorgee nie. 'n Euwele saak word nie goed deur 'n mooi naam daaraan te gee nie. Daarom is dit altyd beter om dit maar by sy eintlike naam te noem. In die huidige landspolitiek het dit nog nooit om iets anders as om apartheid gegaan nie. Moontlik het ds. Van Loggerenberg in „Die Vaderland” van 18 Februarie die berig gelees onder die opskrif: DIE „KLEIN APARTHEID” IS HIER VIR GOED. Die woorde van niemand minder nie as adjunk-minister S. Froneman word daarin aangehaal, met die uitdruklike vermelding dat hy namens die Regering gepraat het. Daar staan in die berig onder meer:

● Oor die „morele regverdiging van diskriminerende apartheidsmatreëls” het mnr. Froneman gesê:

„... Hierdie beheermaatreëls wat in die idioom van die integrasioniste (as) diskriminerend en (as) „klein apartheid” bestempel word, sal moet bly voortbestaan solank daar vreemde werkers binne die wit tuislande is.

„Ek wil ook daarby voeg dat hierdie matreëls nie moreel geregverdig word deur die tydsduur daarvan nie.

„Die standpunt dat daar totale territoriale apartheid (met ander woorde dat elke Bantowerker na sy eie tuisland moet terugkeer), binnekort moet kom anders sou die morele grondslag van hierdie sogenaamde diskriminerende

maatreëls verval, word deur my verwerp.

„Volgens daardie standpunt word sogenaamde klein apartheid as tussentydse maatreëls beskou, maar ons ken geen tussentydse moraliteit nie. Om te beweer dat beheermaatreëls oor vreemde werkers slegs moreel is as dit vir 'n interimperiode is, is te geklik vir woorde.

„Beheermaatreëls vir behoud van identiteit van die eie is in homself 'n morele regverdiging“, het hy gesê. ●

Al sou 'n mens nog net een Christelike haar op jou kop gehad het, behoort dit te rys by die lees van hierdie woorde. Aan die saak verander dit niks dat die adjunk-minister verkies om die lelike woord „diskriminerende“ maatreëls te vervang met „beheermaatreëls“ nie. Dis tog stellig nie die „integrasioniste“ wat uitgevind het dat 'n houding van verwerpende onderskeiding teenoor 'n medemens (en as die blanke bewindvoerders die nie-blankes in wat ook HULLE eie land is, tot vreemdelinge verklaar en as vreemdelinge behandel, is dit 'n verwerpende onderskeiding!) diskriminasie, en niks anders as diskriminasie is nie. En nóg die woord „apartheid“ (klein of groot) nóg die politiek wat daardeur

aangedui word, het sy oorsprong by die „integrasioniste“. Daarom kan geen regeeringswoordvoerder, hoe angsvallig hy ook al probeer, dit ooit konsekwent verhoed dat die woord „apartheid“ hom ontglip as hy die saak waaroor dit in die landspolitiek gaan, in gepaste woorde wil uitdruk nie. Ds. Van Loggerenberg, wat waarskynlik 'n gereelde koerantleser is, sal dit nie kan ontken nie. Met sy erkenning dat apartheid aanvegbaar is (dit behoort vir hom as Christen sonder meer verwerplik te wees) is hy dit aan sy eie gewete verskuldig om op te hou om dit te verdedig; en as bedienaar van die goddelike Woord is hy dan ook verplig om tydig en ontydig die waarheid van die evangelie daarteenoor te stel.

— Redakteur.

WORSHIP NOT A FORM OF ENTERTAINMENT

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

I think the article by Basil Moore, "Mood' Worship," (Feb. issue) calls for comment. As I see it there are two dangers here. Firstly there is the danger

that people, especially young people, will come to regard divine worship as merely another form of entertainment, and secondly there is the danger that the practice of religion will be seen, partly or wholly, as a mere question of mood — If one happens to be in a particular mood, one worships God and practises religion; if not, one finds something else more interesting to do! But the worship of God and the practice of religion are not forms of entertainment or a question of mood; they are solemn duties; duties incumbent on one irrespective of mere human feeling and preference. Certainly there should be a maximum of lay participation in the divine worship of the Church, but this should be brought about in such a way as to exclude extraneous elements such as mere entertainment and mere mood. If we are not careful we shall allow over-secularization to prostitute the Christian religion! A proper balance must be kept so that the due solemnity, respect and decorum that serves to keep in proper perspective the relationship of man to God; of creature to Creator, is preserved, and the inroad of a prostituting over-secularization kept at bay.

Recently Published

Order Your Copy Now!

PROPHETIC CHRISTIANITY IN THE CONGO

By MARIE-LOUISE MARTIN D.D.

A REVEALING FORTY-PAGE DESCRIPTION AND ANALYSIS OF A REMARKABLE CHURCH IN THE CONGO, THE "CHURCH OF CHRIST ON EARTH THROUGH THE PROPHET SIMON KIMBANGU."

Published by the Christian Institute of Southern Africa

(African Independent Churches' Department).

Price 50 cents, including postage.