

# PRO

# VERITATE

## INHOUD/CONTENTS

Soeklig op Utopia .....	1
The Christian and Politics .....	1
Facing Judgment and Truth .....	2
Inleidingsartikel/Editorial .....	5
Lambaréné's Greatheart is Dead .....	6
Hiervan en Daarvan .....	7
Die Tyd vir 'n „Belydende Kerk" is „Nia" Daar .....	9
Readers' Views .....	13

CHRISTELIKE MAANDBLAD VIR SUIDELIKE AFRIKA—CHRISTIAN MONTHLY FOR SOUTHERN AFRICA

September 15 September 1965

Jaargang IV, Nr. 6

5c

Intekengeld R1 Subscription

Volume IV, No. 6

By die Hoofposkantoor as Nuusblad geregistreer.

Registered at the Post Office as a Newspaper.

GEESTESKWELLINGE

# SOEKLIIG OP UTOPIA

DR. W. BRUCKNER DE VILLIERS

Dit was, sover ek kan vasstel, die Griekse wysgeer Plato wat eerste formeel gestalte gegee het aan die mens se eeu-oue droom omtrent die moontlikheid van 'n hemel op aarde. Dit het hy gedoen in sy „Timaeus", maar veral in sy „Republiek", waarin hy 'n begeerlik-onbereikbare beeld geskilder het van 'n werklik ideale, totaal verenigde, demokratiese staat, geskep deur 'n verligte volk en geregeer deur die waarlik wyse manne onder hulle. Self was hy egter wys genoeg om te besef dat hy in sy ideaalstelling in werklikheid besig was om na die bo-menslike hemele te reik en was hy dus ook realisties genoeg om sy volgelinge te waarsku: „Niks groots is maklik nie!"

Na hom was dit die relatief onbekende en obskure Joachim van Floris (c. 1145 — 1202) wat die saak van die kommunale wensdenkery die grootste stoot vorentoe gegee het — en, deur sy invloed, die saak van die Westerse beskawing, en veral van die Christendom, eindeloos skade berokken het.

Dié Joachim was destyds die ab van die klooster van San Giovanni in Fiore (Floris), bekend vanweë sy misties-teologiese teorieë, sy toegewyde asketisme en sy stigting van die sg. „Ordo Florensis". Hy was die skrywer van 'n hele aantal polemiese geskrifte, onder welke die **Concordia novi et veteris Testamenti**, die **Expositio in Apocalypsin**, die **Psalterium decem chordarum** en verskeie kommentare oor die Ou-Testamentiese profete. Met sy profesie dat in die eeu van **plena spiritus libertas** die hele wêreld, onder die heerskappy van monnikke, die **virii spirituales**, 'n reuse-klooster sou word, in die rustyd, die sabbat van die mensheid, het hy opnuut, en dié slag op suiwer Christelik-eschatologiese vlak, die ideaal van 'n hemel hier op aarde herbevestig — en het hy 'n vreemde vuur onder talle van die dro-

mers en wensdenkers van sy eie tyd sowel as van toekomstige geslagte aan die brand gesteeke wat tot vandag toe nog nie geblus is nie, maar nog steeds lustig voort-smeul.

## GEVAARLIKE GEESTESERFENIS

Want Joachim, die droomverlore mistikus, anders as die meer besadigde Plato, het in alle erns (Vervolg op bladsy 2)

## THE CHRISTIAN AND POLITICS

GEORGE J. H. MAGQWASHE

There are people who say that there is no God. They postulate all sorts of theories about the origin of man. There are also those who postulate theories of government which would bring benefits to the people but they deny the efficacy of God's power. Christians, however, believe that unless God is at the centre of any improvement in society, no lasting value can be attached to such improvement. But as Christians we must face those political problems which stare us in the face from day to day.

### LOVE

From his personal experience, a Christian knows that God exists and has proof of the power of His Love. Those who say that God exists but treat Him as though He does not matter in their lives "violate intellectual integrity at the heart."

Love is the key word in the Christian's vocabulary. Jesus Christ revealed God and His majesty to us. As followers of

Christ, we ought to love our fellow-men as God loved us. Those circumstances in which our fellow-men find themselves and which tend to mar their spiritual integrity are the Christian's concern. If there be any law or regulation which tends to hurt our neighbour's dignity as a man and to disfigure the image of God in him, such a state of things is the concern of every Christian.

(Continued on page 2)

# Soeklig op Utopia

(Vervolg van bladsy 1)

geglo in die reële verwesenlikbaarheid van sy wêreldvreemde ideaal. En dit is in dié onsinnige droom dat soveel van sy volgelinge en geestesnasate 'n geestesanker gevind het — met die mees fenomenale en ontwrigtende gevolge vir die hele Christelik-Westerse beskawing wat die argelose erfgenaam sou word van die gevaarlike geesteserfenis wat hy nagelaat het.

Hoewel die kerkowerhede van sy tyd vaagweg tot die besef gekom het dat hulle dit in sy teorieë met iets vreemds en gevaarliks te doen gehad het, het hulle nooit eintlik die volle maat van die potensiële gevaar begryp nie. En hoewel die Lateraanse Konsilie van 1215 hom ligweg oor die vingers geraps en betig het oor sekere van sy geskifte, het hulle hom persoonlik in vrede gelaat en selfs die stigting van die Ordo Florentis goedgekeur. Veral onder die Fransiskane het sy idees vinnig posgevat en sterk aanhang gevind. Die sg. Joachimisme het as partikuliere geestesbeweging binne die kerk sy beslag gevind en selfs op filosofiese gebied het Joachim se leerstellings soveel inslag gevind dat die hele geestesstroming wat hulle ontketen het, losweg as die sg. Neo-Gnostisisme begin bekendstaan het.

Die praktiese gevolge was ontsettend, want oraloor, soms op die vreemdste plekke en onder die onwaarskynlikste omstandighede, het epidemies van dié eienaardige geesteskrankheid soos die masels begin uitslaan. Een na die ander het hulle na vore begin tree — die profete van 'n nuwe hemel hier op aarde, van watter aard dan ook al: Sir Thomas More met sy „Utopia“, Thomas Hobbes, Sir Francis Bacon, Jean-Jacques Rousseau, Friedrich Nietzsche, Karl Marx, Adolf Hitler . . .

## ONPRAKTIES, ONUITVOERBAAR

Op die Place de la Concorde in Parys is triomfantelik 'n standbeeld van die Godin van die Rede opgerig en gekroon — wat terstond bespotlik gemaak sou word deur die krue onredelikhede ge-

pleeg tydens die Franse Revolusie in die naam van sulke loflike ideale soos vryheid, gelykheid en broederskap. In Engeland het die Puriteine gekom met hulle bepaalde konsepsie van 'n nuwe, ideale bedeling — slegs om 'n bloedige burgeroorlog te ontketen onder aanvoering van hul leier Cromwell, die destydse „man van graniet“. In Amerika het die Pelgrimvaders vol hoë idealisme aan wal gestap in die wonderlike Nuwe Wêreld van hul drome — om onmiddellik verstrengel te raak in al die struwelinge, oorloë en bloedvergieting waaruit 'n nuwe nasie uiteindelik gebore sou word. In Rusland het Lenin die Bolsjevistiese Revolusie, een van die bloedigste in die menslike geskiedenis, van stapel gestuur — oënskynlik ter wille van die hoogste ideale en die totstandbrenging van 'n werklik ideale staat. En in Duitsland het 'n totaal besete mannetjie 'n hele volk tot kranksinnigheid verlei met sy droom omtrent 'n suiwer Ariese ras en 'n duisendjarige Duitse ryk . . .

Die mens, anders as die esel, stamp hom skynbaar kompulsief teen dieselfde klip. Ten spyte van die histories oor-en-oor bewese feit dat geen werklik ideale staat of mensegemeenskap nog ooit suksesvol tot stand gebring is nie — dat Joachim van Floris se mistiese droomideaal herhaaldelik as totaal onprakties en onuitvoerbaar uitgewys is — ontstaan daar telkens nog onder andersins hoogs praktiese, besadigde en ingeligte mense nuwe bewegings, organisasies en geestesstrominge wat almal slegs variasies op die ou uitgediende tema van 'n prakties bereikbare hemel op aarde is.

Inderdaad, as 'n mens daarvoor nadink, het feitlik elke nuwe politieke beweging en elke vars sektestroming op kerklike gebied gewoonlik 'n klap van hierdie Joachimistiese hemel-op-aarde filosofie weg.

## CHRISTELIKE OPENBARING

En tog, vreemd genoeg, is dit juis binne die gebied van die sg. **Christelike** beskawing dat hierdie wesenlik onchristelike filosofie sy vrugbaarste teelaarde skyn te gevind het en die weligste floreer. Want heeltemal **onchristelik** is dit tog seker wel.

Selfs sonder om enigsins teologies diepsinnig oor die onderwerp

(Vervolg op bladsy 3)

# The Christian and Politics

(Continued from page 1)

Many professing Christians appear to think that the words of Jesus Christ, "Seek ye first the kingdom of God and all things shall be added unto you" mean that as long as we acknowledge Christ as our Saviour we may leave the solution of our political and other problems to the miraculous power of God. He will see us through, they say.

I am afraid nothing is further from the Christian truth than this standpoint. As Christians, we are to take an **active** part in the struggle for the betterment of political, social, and other conditions of our fellow Christians and of all other fellow human beings. It is because the Christian has accepted Christ as his guide and mentor that such active participation is necessary. Christ's legacy to man is that as Christians we should bear one another's burdens and thus fulfil His Law. The story of the good Samaritan is a case in point. Here the central point to note is, on the one hand, the practical help given to the victim by the Samaritan; and, on the other, the sympathy of the two men who passed by — which indeed may have existed but was not translated into practical terms — and did not, therefore, help the victim. Thus the question to ask is not whether the Christian ought to take part or an active interest in politics or not, but how far such part or interest could be taken in keeping with Christian teachings.

## GOD AT THE CENTRE

You might argue that as ordinary people your scope in this field is necessarily limited. I certainly do not advise you to abandon your normal activities so as to take part in politics. Moreover, you may not have the experience that such a struggle entails. But it is my duty to broaden your outlook and to point to the horizons at which you ought to aim. Also, I should like you to realise that the Christian would enter the struggle primarily as one fired with the

(Continued on page 4)

# Soeklig op Utopia

(Vervolg van bladsy 2)

te raak moet dit tog by eerste oogopslag reeds duidelik wees dat die mens en die mensegemeenskap, volgens die Christelike openbaring altans, op die mees ondubbelzinnige wyse uitgewerp is uit die Paradys en dat dié Paradys hier op aarde nie weer te herwin is nie; dat die deur sonde vertroebelde mensewêreld geen ideale wêreld is of ooit kan word nie; dat die **imago dei** in die mensekapsel onherstelbaar en feitlik onherkenbaar verbrokkel is; dat die mens homself nie kan red of ooit die hemel kan beërwe nie, nòg deur enige geïnspireerde **itinerarium mentis ad deum**, nòg deur 'n ydele kommunale strewe tot die opbou van 'n toring van Babel wat tot by die hemele sal reik; dat die Christen se lewe op aarde onvermydelik 'n lewe van stryd en beproewing is, 'n ware **via crucis**; dat daar, hier op hierdie onherbergsame aarde, 'n harde en dikwels onaangename taak, die taak van getuigenis te midde van aanvegting en persoonlike heiligmaking te midde van versoeking, aan hom opgedra is, en dat hy, eers nadat die stryd tot die einde volstry is, weer die vooruitsig het op toelating tot 'n hemelse Paradys, uitsluitlik op grond van die goddelike genade en die verdienste van Christus, sy Saligmaker, aan die kruis.

## KRUISEVANGELIE

Van hierdie paradoksale „heils“-boodskap, van hierdie onverbiddelike **kruisevangelie** het die gemiddelde mens, selfs die belydende Christenmens, nog nooit gehou nie. Dáárom word daar voortdurend nog na kortpaaie gesoek, na gladde slagspreuke en towerformules om te dien as kussings teen die werklikheid van die Christelike verantwoordelikheid, na Utopias, nuwe Paradijse, bereikbare hemele-op-aarde, wat kan dien om die aandag af te lei van die harde eise van naakte en oortuigde Christenskap. Dáárom bou ons nog steeds lustig voort aan ons droomkastele. Dáárom fantaseer ons so graag omtrent ons onwerklike en onverwenslikbare mistiese ideale . . .

Ook vir ons hier in Suid-Afrika, wat dit nog durf waag om onself Christene te noem, moet hierdie feite ernstige bedenkinge inhou. Want ook ons is sekerlik nie, beide op kerklike en politieke gebied, geheel enal vry te spreek van 'n wesenlik heidense wensdenkery en 'n totaal onchristelike Neo-Gnostiese kettery nie. Ook ons het so dikwels in die verlede die maklike pad gekies wat toentertyd reeds deur Joachim van Floris uitgestippel is: die pad na Utopia, na 'n mensgemaakte hemel op aarde. Ook ons het al so dikwels gestreef na die weertotstandkoming van 'n ewiglik verlore Paradys en uitgetrek op soek na 'n nuwe Land Kanaän — slegs om telkens weer totaal bedroë daarvan af te kom, soos al die Utopia-soekers voor ons en van ons eie tyd.

Wat ons, soos almal van hulle, heeltemal vergeet het, was dat sir Thomas More, toe hy die woord „Utopia“ bedink het, dit gebaseer het op die twee Griekse woorde „ou“, wat beteken „nie“, en „topos“, wat gelykstaan aan „plek“. „Utopia“ is dus letterlik, en was nog altyd gewees, „'n plek wat hoegenaamd nie bestaan nie“ — en een wat nooit kán bestaan nie.

## VERSOEKING

Ook ons het in die versoeking verval om ons heil te soek in noukeurige gedefinieerde, en soms selfs wetlik afgeforseerde, gemeenskapsideale; soos suiwere, hervormde, volksbehoudende en outomaties anti-liberale Nasiona-lisme; „aparte vryhede“ vir alle rasse-groepe; 'n holisties gekonsipieerde Federasie van Suid-Afrikaanse volkere; 'n ideale, „Progressiewe“ demokrasie gebaseer op 'n (vermoedelik deur werklik wyse manne) gekwalifiseerde stemreg; 'n kerk wat sal optree as mondstuk en vaandeldraer van 'n nuwe uitverkore volk; 'n werklik „Christelik-Nasionale“ onderwysstelsel ens. ens. ens.

Rondom ons wemel dit van die gerieflike slagspreuke wat ons volks- en kerkleiers feitlik daagliks besig is om vir ons en ter wille van die beswyming van ons volk vir ons te bedink: „Behoud van die blanke beskawing in Suider-Afrika“; „Volle geregtigheid in eie kring“; „Vrye konsultasie tussen alle rasse-groepe“; „Behoud van 'n unieke tradisie en volks-erfenis“;

„Behoud van die ‚Bybelse‘ differensiasiebeginsel . . .“

Ons hele gemeenskapslewe skyn deesdae te weergalm van die alomhoorbare slagkreet: „Behoud van . . .“ (asook, natuurlik die versweë en onuitgesproke: „Vrees vir . . .!“)

## ONS TAAK

Wat almal van ons gevaar staan om oor die hoof te sien is dat ons die hemel hier op aarde nooit sal bereik of verkry nie — ook nie selfs óns hier in Suid-Afrika nie — maar dat die dikwels onaangename, dog onontkomelike taak ons opgelê is om hier in ons eie Vaderland te leer om as verantwoordelike Christenmense met werklik Christelike verantwoordelikheid en regverdigheid op te tree teenoor ons mede-Christene, hoeseer verskillend hulle ookal van ons mag wees. En ook, en veral — in opdrag van die Meester self — teenoor die heidene en hulle wat nog nie die lig ontvang het nie . . .

Sover dit hierdie opdrag aangaan, sal geen Utopistiese wensdenkery en geen dromery oor volks- en kerkmistiek ons 'n tree verder aanhelp nie. Daar staan 'n ontsaglike taak vir almal van ons voor die deur. En dié taak kan alleen, uiteindelik, deur werklik geroepe Christenmense verrig word.

## AAN LESERS VAN PRO VERITATE

Dit spyt ons innig dat 'n briefie onder die briefhoof van die Christelike Instituut in verband met ds. James Moulder aan ons lesers gestuur is. Die inhoud van die brief is vir die lesers van PRO VERITATE bedoel en moes, natuurlik, op 'n PRO VERITATE-briefhoof gewees het. Ons vertrou van harte dat ons u nie enige ongerief aangedoen het nie en, indien wel, vra ons u om verskoning.

## TO READERS OF PRO VERITATE

We are sorry that a letter about the Rev. James Moulder was sent to our readers on a letterhead of the Christian Institute. The content of the letter was meant for readers of PRO VERITATE but the letter should, of course, have been on a PRO VERITATE letterhead. We do hope that we have not embarrassed our readers, and if we did, we do ask you to pardon us.

# The Christian and Politics

(Continued from page 2)

spirit of Christ and guided by him to render to man such service as he is sure is service to God or for God. This is what it means to place God at the centre of your life.

Non-Christian leaders, some of them quite good men, believe in their own ability to put things right in society. The Christian depends on the guidance of God and nothing will deter him once God has spoken to him. Moses and Samuel both listened to God for their guidance. Once the terms of their call were clear to them, they went into the field of leadership with all its disappointment and set backs. Can you expect to find anything different in your lives?

You might also argue that as members of the less privileged group in society, you are not able to make an effective contribution to the political struggles of our country as a whole. You do not have to wait for what may be regarded as big opportunities for service to put your Christian experience into operation. In the biggest as in the smallest opportunities available for service, the Christian is equally accountable to God for what he did not do. Moreover, we get our reward for being faithful in the small things of life — and then we can be trusted to shoulder our responsibilities in the big things. Also, the less privileged your racial group is, the more is the responsibility for you as a Christian to render service.

## INDIVIDUAL RESPONSIBILITY

The Rev. Beyers Naude of the Christian Institute has called attention to the outlook which exists in many of our own people. I confess I have committed this sin myself at one time or another. This is the confession of other people's sins. If the more privileged group of Society has left undone things they ought to have done and have done things they ought not to have done I am sure God is competent to deal with them accordingly. Of course we

have to speak the truth as we see it and behave at all times as believers and not mere speakers of the truth. But our own sins of commission and omission are our individual responsibility. It is we and we alone who will account for these sins. Shall we fail God in this task? God has called us unto liberty to serve one another by love. "Faithful is he that called you, who will also do it."

There is no dividing line between politics and Christian living. We have seen that the one is part of the other and that the Christian is directly concerned about the interests of his fellow-men in their totality. One of the last charges given to Christians by Christ himself is that they are

to humanise and to Christianise the world. Everything that the Christian speaks, or thinks, or does, must be measured against this charge in relation to all men.

Moreover, the teaching of Christ is essentially that of a new relationship of love between God and man and between man and man; Christ revealed the whole purpose of man and the latter's infinite chances of service to his Master. Surely, one such opportunity for service is that of the Christian to his fellow-men in the field of politics.

\* \* \*

*The above is an address delivered to the senior students of the Langa High School, Cape Town, in April, 1965.*

## FACING JUDGMENT AND TRUTH

### A REPLY TO DR. MES

By P. ALLEN MYRICK

**In the last issue of *Pro Veritate* Dr. G. M. Mes (in "Give a Dog a Bad Name . . .") attacks my analysis both of the Old Testament and of the South African situation, as this is set forth in two articles ("The Rule of God and White Supremacy", April 1965, and "The Land is God's", July 1965).**

The editor has kindly invited me to reply to Dr. Mes' criticisms. I should like first of all to comment on Mes' understanding of the Old Testament and of South Africa; and then to make some general observations on Dr. Mes' concern for the mercy of God and the unity of the Church.

### THE RELEVANCE OF THE PROPHETS

I have written out of the belief that the Bible as a whole and the Old Testament prophets in particular have a message which is especially relevant to the social and political problems of South Africa today. The Bible believes that God makes himself known primarily through specific events on human history; and that if his people take these events of revelation seriously, they will cease to be simply happenings of long ago but will become contemporary. They will speak with power and authority to the Church and the world today. One studies the Bible not chiefly for personal inspiration or to learn about "religious ideals," but because there one

sees what God has done in the life of his people, and one discovers that God is doing very much the same thing in our lives today.

When the greatest prophets preached in the eighth and seventh centuries before Christ, the Hebrew community had fallen into a state of political and social evil so great that God could no longer permit this community to continue its present existence. The prophets declared that judgment, in the form of national destruction, was inescapable; and if there was any hope for a new life of peace and prosperity, this lay only on the other side of judgment.

Christians in many lands and generations have discovered that the prophetic message of judgment upon an evil nation speaks directly to them. The prophetic word has become contemporary as have few other parts of the Old Testament. Men who have pondered the words of the prophets have realised that they are describing modern societies and governments as well as ancient, and that their call to repentance and their threat of judgment cannot be

(Continued on page 11)

## Inleidingsartikel:

*Die Eer van die Kerk*

Dit behoort tot die eer van die kerk dat hy in hierdie wêreld waar die leuen skynbaar heers, die draer van die waarheid is. Daarmee dra die kerk ook kennis van die aard van die waarheid; dit is geen onnaspeurlike geheim nie, maar deur God geopenbaar. Uit sy Woord weet ons bv. wat die oorsprong, wese en bestemming van alle dinge is, en hoe die wêreld en die menselewe op aarde ingerig en geleef moet word volgens sy bedoeling. As die kerk en die Christene hieroor bly weifel, het hulle geen roeping, geen gesag, geen heilsboodskap, geen woord van bevryding meer nie. Daar is niks wat in hierdie wêreld nog so 'n bevrydende krag het soos die waarheid nie. Die kerk tas nie in die duister rond op soek na 'n heilsweg vir die wêreld nie; hy ken daardie weg en verkondig dit met gesag te midde van alle heilsteorieë en heilseksperimente wat die wêreld verwar.

Dit lê tewens in die aard van die waarheid dat, hoe louter en hoe ewig dit ook al mag wees, dit in hierdie wêreld aangeveg word. Dit word van alle kante onder die leuen bedolwe. Daarom hou die kerk ook nooit op om te stry om die waarheid nie. Hy doen dit egter sonder wanhoop, sonder onsekerheid. Soms bevind hy hom daarmee op 'n lang en moeisame pad. Maar gelukkig weet hy ook wat die aard van die leuen is, hoe subtiel en hoe brutaal. Voor een van die grootste leuenapostels van die geskiedenis dit uitgespreek het, het die kerk al geweet: „'n Besliste faktor om 'n leuen geglo te kry, is die grootte van die leuen. Die groot massa mense val, in hul eenvoudigheid van hart, makliker ten prooi aan 'n groot leuen as aan 'n kleintjie.” Die satan was die eerste wat dit op die proef gestel het met die suggestie aan die mens dat God lieg; en geen leuen was ooit so geslaagd nie. Maar hoe geslaagder die leuen, hoe feller is die stryd om die waarheid. Dit is die stryd van die kerk deur die eeue. Daaraan veral ontleen hy sy karakter as „ecclesia militans”, strydende kerk.

Die kerk in Suid-Afrika is tans met 'n groot leuen gekonfronteer: met 'n beleid, 'n menslike ideologie, 'n politieke eksperiment wat hom tot belydenis, tot goddelike evangelie, tot onfeilbare heilsboodskap wil verhef — 'n leuen wat die grootste brutaliteit met die fynste subtiliteit paar. Brutaal, omdat hy so groot is — 'n evangelie wat geen evangelie is nie; subtiel omdat hy so religieus is — hy lê op die Woord van God beslag. Dit kan miskien die stryd van die kerk lank en moeilik maak, maar nie hope-loos, soos 'n getas in die duister nie. 'n Boom word aan sy vrugte geken. 'n Leuen ook. En as die kerk maar weet waarmee hy te doen het, is sy stryd in beginsel reeds gewonne.

Die kerk weet bv. waarmee hy te doen het as 'n geheime politieke organisasie amptelike kerkvergaderings binnedring om sý gesag in die besluite wat geneem word, te laat geld en dan daar uitgaan, die wêreld in, met die lasterlike roemtaal: „Christus-

(Vervolg op bladsy 11)

## Editorial:

*The Church's Honour*

It is part of the Church's honour that in this world in which the lie seemingly rules, the Church is the bearer of the truth. By virtue of this the Church also has knowledge of the nature of truth; it is no inscrutable secret, but it is revealed by God. From His Word we know for example the origin, essence and destiny of all things and how the world and human life should be conducted and lived in accordance with His purpose. If the Church and Christians should continuously waver about this, then they no longer have a calling, authority, a message of salvation, a word of liberation. Nothing in the world is still such a power of liberation as is the truth. The Church does not have to grope about in the dark in search of a way of salvation for this world; it knows the way and proclaims it with authority in the midst of all theories of salvation and of all experiments in search of salvation which confuse the world.

It is, besides, inherent in the nature of the truth that however pure and however eternal it may be, it is assailed in this world. From all sides it is buried by the lie. For this reason the Church never ceases to fight for the truth. It does this, however, without despair or uncertainty. In this battle it sometimes finds itself on a long and laborious road. But fortunately it also possesses knowledge of the nature of the lie, however subtle or brutal it may be. Long before one of the greatest apostles of the lie expressed it, the Church knew that "a definite factor in getting a lie believed, is the size of the lie. The broad mass of people, in the simplicity of their hearts, more easily fall victim to a big lie than to a small one." Satan was the first to test this with the suggestion to man that God lies; and no lie has been more successful. But the more successful the lie, the fiercer is the battle for the truth. This has been the battle of the Church through the ages. From this stems its character as **ecclesia militans**, the Church Militant.

The Church in South Africa is at present confronted with a big lie, with a policy, a human ideology, a political experiment which wishes to elevate itself to a position of a confession, a godly gospel, an infallible message of salvation, a lie which couples the greatest brutality with the greatest subtlety. This lie is brutal because it is big — a gospel which is no gospel; subtle because it is so religious — it claims the Word of God. It can perhaps prolong and aggravate the battle of the Church but it cannot make it hopeless, as a groping in the dark. A tree is known by its fruit. A lie also. And if the Church only knows with what it is confronted, its battle is already won in principle. The Church knows for instance with what it has to grapple when a secret political organisation penetrates into official church meetings in order to enforce its authority on the decisions which are taken, decisions which are then sent into the world with the blasphemous and boast-

(Continued on page 11)

# LAMBARÉNÉ'S GREATHEART IS DEAD

REV. S. P. FREELAND

Fifty-two years ago a young man of outstanding energy, ability and versatility made a momentous decision. Already an international celebrity in the realms of theology, philosophy and music, he turned his back on what would undoubtedly have been a brilliant career to bury himself in the African jungle.

It was an extraordinary thing to do; but Albert Schweitzer was an extraordinary man. His decision startled his family and his friends, but nothing they could say or do was able to deflect him from his purpose.

"I want to be able to help without talking," he insisted. "It is something I **have** to do."

On Good Friday, 1913, he set out with his wife, first by train and then by sea. In due time Schweitzer reached his goal — the squalid, disease-ridden African village of Lambaréné. His real life's work had begun.

And now he is no more. This missionary Greatheart, after more than half a century of loving and devoted service in equatorial Africa — his devotion has been a constant inspiration to countless thousands of people all over the world — has died in the little hospital where he lived so splendidly.

Yet, after such a life, death has little meaning. Is he dead? Will he not live on, in the Lambaréné hospital, in the thousands of African people whose bodies he has healed and whose lives he has saved?

Will he not live on in the inspiration and challenge that his life and witness has been to so many? Has he not joined

... the choir invisible

Of those immortal dead who live again

In minds made better by their presence: live

In pulses stirred to generosity,

In deeds of daring rectitude, in scorn

For miserable aims that end with self,

In thoughts sublime that pierce the night like stars,

And with their mild persistence urge man's search

To vaster issues?

Albert Schweitzer and his work at Lambaréné, in West Africa, are

so well known that it would seem redundant to tell the story of his life and work. He has been called the black man's brother, the living legend of Lambaréné.

Honoured all over the world for many years, he received the Nobel Prize and the Order of Merit. A few years ago he was described by President Eisenhower as "the greatest man living today."

Yet he fitted into no neat, tidy conventional pattern. Only against the turbulent, tyrannical jungle which he tamed to his tremendous will could he be seen for what he was — a man with vision and purpose, acting under an inner compulsion which he could only describe as a call from God.

Nothing in his family background suggested intellectual genius or rare saintliness. His father, it is true, was a Protestant clergyman, but he was not built in any extraordinary mould.

The family was large — and poor. Yet they were well-cared for, and even as a lad Albert seemed to rebel against the comforts of his life. He refused, on one occasion, to wear an overcoat to school in the depth of winter, because his friends had none.

"I want not to be different from anyone else," he said.

Two other traits marked him out at an early age. He was — like many others who were to become famous before him — unusually precocious. And he passionately loved study and music.

At the remarkably early age of nine he was able to act as substitute for the organist at the local church when necessary. It was not many years later that, encouraged by the great organist and composer, Charles-Marie Widor, he wrote what is still regarded as the greatest book on the music of Bach.

He had other deep interests, too. Science, philosophy, theology — all

these attracted him to such an extent that he became a recognised authority as teacher and thinker in every one of them.

Above all was a deep sense of distress in the face of suffering, whether man's or that of other living creatures. Very early in life he longed to join "the Fellowship of those who bear the Mark of Pain."

## AFRICA

What made him choose Africa as his field of life service?

Two answers may be given to this question. As a boy he was deeply affected by the carved figures of a giant negro, part of a monument to a French admiral. The black man's head was bowed, and on his face was an expression of infinite sadness and pain.

The figure became for the young Schweitzer a symbol. It haunted him day and night like a cloud. In his "Memories of Childhood and Youth" he writes of it:

"Sometimes it left me alone, so that I breathed freely again and fancied once more that I was at liberty to become the sole arbiter of my fate. But the little cloud had risen above the horizon. I could indeed look away and lose sight of it for a while, but it was growing, notwithstanding; slowly but surely it grew and at last it hid the whole sky."

An accidental discovery provided the second reason for his choice of Africa.

At the age of 29 — he had already decided when the time was ripe to give his life to the alleviation of suffering — he was appointed Principal of St. Thomas's College. One day he came across a report of the work of the Paris Missionary Society in the steaming forests of the Congo basin.

It described, simply but with vivid realism, the sufferings of Africans, victims as they were of the many diseases which spread so quickly in that part of the continent. And it stressed that if medical aid

(Continued on page 10)

HIERVAN EN DAARVAN

# DIE LYS

„Ek sien jou naam is op die lys!

Kan jy jou onskuld nie bewys?”

„Aan so 'n lys steur ek my nie:

Dit bring nóg skuld nóg onskuld mee.

Wat drommel, man! Sal so 'n Ján-Rap

Met pen en ink vir ons kom uittrap?”

„Maar dink daaraan: sy woord is wet!

Hoe durf jy jou teen hom verset?”

„Ek buig my slegs voor een Gesag,

Een Woord, een Heer, een Oppermag.

Hy is dit wat my vry laat gaan:

Op Sy lys moet ook my naam staan.”

Vergewe my tog maar hierdie rympies, geagte leser. 'n Mens moet op die een of ander manier uiting gee aan jou gevoelens, en soms is 'n rympie nog die beste manier. Die reeds berugte „Affêre van die Lys” het 'n golf van diepgevoelde verontwaardiging oor heel Suid-Afrika laat gaan; en saam met die Romeinse digter van ouds sal ek ook maar net sê dat,

„Waar my talent tekortsiet, my verontwaardiging verse sal maak.” En met dieselfde digter sou 'n mens deesdae wil uitroep:

„Dit is moeilik om nie satires te skryf nie!”

Kyk om u heen, beskou die dinge wat deesdae in die politieke lewe van die Afrikaanse kerke en in die kerklike lewe van ons Afrikaanse politiek plaasvind, en vra uself af: wat sou 'n Juvenalis, of 'n Cervantes, of 'n Swift hiervan gemaak het? Waarlik, hier lê stof vir 'n satire van groot formaat. Maar waar vind ons die gees wat opgewasse is om reg daaraan te laat geskied? 'n Langenhoven sou dit miskien kon gedoen het, maar ons het geen Langenhovens meer nie. En Peter Blum woon nie meer onder ons nie.

## GROOT-INKWISITEUR

Die gegewens lê klaar. Daar is die geheime Bloedraad wat hul proskripsielyste opstel, en teen wie se vonnis geen appèl aangeteken kan word nie. Daar is die Groot-Inkwisiteur wat in die naam van die Kerk hom afsloof om beskuldigings op te stel, wie se taal die taal van 'n maniak is, en wie se denke die denke van 'n besetene is. Die Hond van God! Daar is die ywerige handlangers en adjudante, die professio-

nele defameerders en beswadderaars, die geslepe propagandiste, die gewikste apologete, die magtige beskermhere. Daar is die leuen in naam van die Waarheid, die haat in naam van die Liefde, die gewetenlose valsheid in die naam van Jesus Christus. Gaan lees weer 'n keer die geskiedenis van die Pouslike Inkwisisie in die Nederlande, geagte leser, en u sal verbaas wees om te ontdek hoe bekend dit alles vir ons is. Alva, Granville, Vargas, De Requesens — ons herken hulle maar al te goed! Hulle is karakters wat nooit sterf nie: in elke eeu is hulle weer daar, en die martelaar van eergister is die Inkwisiteur van vandag. Die trotse „nasate van Geus en Hugenoot” word op hul beurt ketterjagters, die vervolgedes word vervolgers, die erbarmlike skape word onbarmhartige wolwe. Dit is die Ironie, met 'n hoofletter geskrywe, van ons huidige situasie.

## WAT MOET ONS DINK?

Wat moet ons dink van 'n politieke dagblad wat hom voortdurend op die mees direkte wyse inmeng in die sake van kerkrade en ringe en sinodes? wat weier om verklarings van die Chr. Instituut te publiseer, en dan onmiddellik die Instituut daarvan beskuldig dat hy hom slegs van die „vyandelike” pers wil bedien? wat los en vas mense se name aan die Instituut koppel en hulle dan uitnooi om te sê of hulle lede is of nie? En wat moet ons vir die toekoms verwag van 'n groot leserspubliek wie se denke deur hierdie soort van derderangse joernalistieke gekonkel vervorm en verknoei word?

Wat moet ons dink van die eerlik-

heid van mense wat eers 'n uitgerekte senuwee-oorlog voer teen predikante wat iets met die Instituut te doen het, en wat dan, wanneer so 'n lys gepubliseer word, van „lafhartigheid” praat wanneer predikante weier om ja of nee te antwoord? Hoe goed, en hoe tereg, was daardie antwoord van 'n Randse leraar, toe hy gesê het dat hy hierdie saak alleen teenoor sy Kerk en sy gewete hoef te verantwoord!

'n Mens voel dankbaar vir die stroom van verontwaardigde proteste wat hierdie onbesonne aksie van Die Transvaler oor die hele land heen opgeroep het, ook van die kant van koerante en persone wat origins nie met die Christelike Instituut saamgaan nie. Dit is soos Dawie van Die Burger geskryf het: „Baie ordentlike mense moet 'n afkeer voel van sulke metodes. Hulle moet wonder of 'n saak wat op so 'n manier gevoer word, werklik 'n goeie saak kan heet.”

Nou vra 'n mens jou af: as mense so duidelik sien wie en wat die vyande van die Christelike Instituut is, moet hulle dan nie noodwendig ook anders oor die Instituut self gaan dink nie? Moet hulle dan nie insien dat 'n liggaam wat sulke reaksies opwek, 'n onmisbare funksie uitoefen nie? Dit is daarom teleurstellend dat daar onder al die verklarings wat gedoen is, so bitter weinig positiewe waardering vir die Instituut self te bespeur was. Dit is ook jammer dat diegene wat gesê het dat hulle nie lede van die Instituut is nie, nie ook terselfdertyd tog 'n woord van waardering en ondersteuning vir die Instituut daarby gevoeg het nie. Dubbel waardevol is daarom die moedige verklaring wat gedoen is deur Ds. J. D. Smith van die Suid-Transvaalse Sinode.

## DIE KERK

Ons sal nou afwag om te sien wat ons kerklike blaaië oor die saak te sê sal hê. Hulle is in 'n moeilike hoek, want die saak wat hulle tot dusver saam met Die Transvaler gepropageer het, is nou deur Neels

Natte lelik verbrou. Hulle kan nie daardie rubriekskrywer verdedig nie, want dan weerspreek hulle bewustelik die gevoelens van elke regdenkende predikant en lidmaat in die Kerk; maar hoe kan hulle hom veroordeel sonder om daarmee te erken dat daar teen die Christelike Instituut metodes gebruik word wat nie eerbaar genoem kan word nie? Ek is bly dat dit nie my dilemma is nie; laat hulle maar daarmee sweet!

Dit kan ook nouliks toevallig wees dat die langdurige kampanje teen die Christelike Instituut juis nou sy toppunt bereik, vlak voor die sitting van die Kaapse Sinode. Glo maar dat daar 'n ryke oes van beskrywingspunte sal dien wat sal vra om „daadwerklike aksie” teen die „veelrassige” Instituut van „Meneer Beyers Naudé”! En glo maar dat daar georganiseerde druk uitgeoefen sal word om die „regte” manne in die Moderatuur verkies te kry!

Ag, dit is alles so deursigtig, so kinderagtig, dat 'n mens maar net lekker daarvoor sou wil lag — as dit nie so gevaarlik was nie. Immers, ons stry nie vir die Christelike Instituut nie, maar vir die Kerk self. Die Instituut sal op 'n goeie dag weer van die toneel verdwyn; maar wat het dan intussen geword van daardie sake waarvoor die Instituut hom beywer het, en waarvoor hy tans met alle kragte probeer te getuig? Wat sal dan geword het van ons mense se begrip van wat die Kerk moet wees? Wat sal dan geword het van die daadwerklike kontak tussen die lidmate van verskillende kerke? Wat sal geword het van ons verpligtinge teenoor die nie-blanke Christene van Suid-Afrika, die mense teenoor wie ons houding nie langer onder die woord „sending” tuisgebring kan word nie? Die Instituut is op sigself van geen belang nie, maar hierdie dinge is van die allergrootste belang. Daarom is dit u en my plig om voort te gaan met ons getuienis — nie ter wille van die Instituut nie, maar ter wille van die Kerk van Christus in Suid-Afrika.

Die Transvaler en sy vriende het hulle lys. Laat hulle dit gerus hê. Laat hulle al die sadistiese plesier daaruit put wat hulle kan. Ons is aan hulle niks hoegenaamd verskuldig nie. Ons weet van 'n ander lys: die lys wat eenmaal afgelees sal word wanneer die boeke geopen word. Op dáárdie lys mag ons name nie ontbreek nie.

\* \* \*

## DIE „VEELRASSIGE” INSTITUUT

Dit is deesdae mode in die joernalistieke wêreld om voortdurend te praat van „die veelrassige Christelike Instituut van Meneer Beyers Naudé” — netsoos 'n mens sou praat van „die veelsydige skulpeversameling van die Hertog van Gloucester”, of so iets. Tot my teleurstelling bemerk ek dat ook Die Burger aan hierdie lawwe mode meedoen. Ek maak beswaar.

Die woord „veelrassig” het vir Afrikaanse ore geen aangename klank nie. Dit roep beelde op van gemengde danspartye in twyfelagtige kringe. Dit weet die vyande van die Instituut baie goed en daarom laat hulle nooit na om juis hierdie adjektief te gebruik sodra daar van die Christelike Instituut sprake is nie. Dit is dus eenvoudig 'n berekende stukkie populêre sielkunde wat die uitwerking moet hê om die groot publiek te laat glo dat die Instituut 'n voorstander is van daardie verskriklike ding wat genoem word „integrasie”. En as mense eers dit glo, dan hoef jy geen verdere moeite te doen om die Instituut in 'n slegte lig te stel nie. Dit is genoeg.

### VERNAAMSTE KENMERK?

Maar ek het nog 'n verdere, en veel ernstiger beswaar. Dit is, dat op hierdie wyse die indruk gewek word as sou **veelrassigheid** die eerste en vernaamste kenmerk van die Instituut wees. U en ek wat lede is, weet hoe onjuis so 'n voorstelling van sake is. Hierdie Instituut is opgerig om Christene van alle kerke en rasse in hierdie land bymekaar te bring: nie in een kerkverband nie, want dit kan nie; ook nie in een volksverband nie, want dit kan nog minder; maar in een geestesverband, in een gespreksgemeenskap — want dit kan wél, en dit moet ook, as ons ons Meester nie ongehoorsaam wil wees nie. Die veelrassigheid van ons organisasie is dus eenvoudig 'n natuurlike uitvloeisel van ons Bybelse strewe in hierdie veelrassige land. En dit bring my tot 'n verdere vraag.

Wanneer ek so lees hoe daar smalend verwys word na die „veelrassige” Instituut, dan vra ek my altyd weer met verwondering af: Maar woon ons dan nie in 'n veelrassige land nie? En wanneer die Kerk van Jesus Christus in so 'n land geplant word, moet dit dan nie noodwendig

ook op die een of ander manier, en êrens, en somtyds, veelrassig wees nie? Daar kan goeie redes wees vir die bestaan van afsonderlike kerkorganisasies vir rassegroepe wat op allerlei wyse sterk van mekaar verskil; maar is dit die einde van die saak? Moet daar dan geen gereelde broederlike kontak tussen hierdie kerke plaasvind nie? En wanneer dit plaasvind, is die Kerk soos dit daar tot manifestasie kom, dan nie veelrassig nie? Of om dit anders-om te stel: as die Kerk in 'n veelrassige land nooit meer en nêrens meer homself as veelrassig laat sien nie, is dit dan nog wel die Kerk van Jesus Christus? Het dit dan nie die kerk (met 'n kleinlettertjie) van 'n bepaalde groep geword nie?

### ERENAAM

Daarom verfoei ek hierdie misbruik wat van die woord „veelrassig” gemaak word, en aanvaar ek dit andersyds graag as 'n **erenaam** wat aan ons toegeken word, soos die benaming „Geus” ook van skelnaam gemaak is tot erenaam. As die Christelike Instituut veroordeel word omdat dit veelrassig is, dan is dit 'n **eervolle veroordeling**; want die Kerk van Jesus op hierdie aarde was nog nooit iets anders as veelrassig nie.

— ERASMIUS

## PRO VERITATE

Verskyn elke 15de van die maand.

### Korrespondensie en Administrasie:

Alle briewe vir die redaksie en die administrasie aan:  
Posbus 487, Johannesburg.

### Redaksionele Bestuur:

Ds. A. W. Habelgaarn,  
Ds. E. E. Mahabane,  
Ds. A. L. Mncube,  
Ds. J. E. Moulder,  
Mnr. J. Oglethorpe,  
Ds. R. Orr,  
Prof. dr. A. van Selms.

### Assistent-redakteur:

Dr. B. Engelbrecht,

### Redakteur:

Ds. C. F. B. Naudé.

### Intekengeld:

Republiek van Suid-Afrika, S.W.A., die Rhodesië en Protektorate:  
**R1** per jaar vooruitbetaalbaar.  
Oorsee: **R1.50** per jaar vooruitbetaalbaar.

**Tjeks en posorders** moet uitgemaak word aan „Pro Veritate” (Edms.) Bpk., Posbus 487, Johannesburg.

Gedruk deur Prompt Drukkers Maatskappy (Edms.) Bpk., Harrisstraat 11, Westgate, Johannesburg.



# DIE TYD VIR 'N „BELYDENDE KERK” IS „NIE” DAAR

DS. NICO VAN LOGGERENBERG

Dit is volkome duidelik dat mnr. Beyers Naudé hom in 'n onbewaakte oomblik van verbittering aan die omstrede artikel: „Die tyd vir 'n „Belydende Kerk’ is daar” gewaag het. Daarom die ooglopende gebrek aan onderskeiding. Dit is 'n growwe veralgemening en geen waarheidsgetuïenis pro veritate, nie, maar 'n onbeteueld verontwaardiging wat geen meerdere getuïenis oor die „ek-getuïenis” wil en kan aanvaar nie.

## (A) FEITELIKE INHOUD

Dit is noodsaaklik dat ons ter wille van ons Christelike getuïenis die omstrede artikel wetenskaplik ontleed en beoordeel, want die blad *Pro Veritate* het met hierdie soort artikels genoeg skade aan die kerk en verwarring tussen struikelende sondaars, ware gelowiges, veroorsaak.

### (a) Ontstaansgronde

Die ongebalanseerde artikel, „persoonlike oortuiging” en menings, het sy ontstaansgronde in (i) „die deursoeking van die kantore van die Christelike Instituut” en die huis van die skrywer i.v.m. kommunistiese en A.N.C. dokumente; (ii) „die besluite van die Sinodale Kommissie van die N.G. Kerk van Suid-Transvaal insake lidmaatskap” van die Instituut en *Pro Veritate* en (iii) die herroeping van die bevestiging van die skrywer tot ouderling, gevind. Hierdie drievoudige teleurstelling het die skrywer na die pen laat gryp. Die gemoedsverontwasting is dus menslik te begryp, maar die onwetenskaplike sameflansing van uiteenlopende „persoonlike oortuigings” en onbewese „menings” as waarheidsgetuïenis, dit is onbegryplik.

### (b) Die skrywer verontwaardig

Die skrywer grond sy verontwaardiging veral op twee gronde, t.w. 'n „algehele verwerping van die kommunisme” deur en die „valse aanklagte” teen die Instituut.

### (i) Verwerping van Kommunisme

Die Instituut sou by herhaling die kommunisme as ideologie en sy werksmetodes in algehele sin verwerp het en daar bestaan geen positiewe „bevestiging” dat „die Christelike Instituut of *Pro Veritate* kommunistiese leerstelling of oogmerke nastreef” soos deur die „argwaan . . . doelbewus geskep” word nie. Dit is 'n vreemde stelling en die bewysgronde vir hierdie oortuiging van die skrywer as sou die Instituut van so iets beskuldig word, ontbreek in die geheel en kan daarom nie getoets word nie. Die doelstelling van beide, *Pro Veritate* en die Instituut „is 'n suiwer Christelike waar die Woord van God en die boodskap van die Skrif in alles op alle gebiede tot alle mense spreek.” Hierdie ongemotiveerde ingeslane doelstrewes is nog nooit deur enige Instituut-gesinde teoloog op skriftuurlike, kerkregtelike en belydenisgronde omskrywe nie. Dit word slegs as onbewese pretensie verewangeliseer en onfeilbaar gehandhaaf. Die werklike inhoud van die doel-

strewes moet teologies, kerkregtelik op beginselvlak eers bewys en getoets word.

### (ii) Valse aanklagte

Die sogenaamde „valse aanklagte” word vaagweg omlin en as 'n soort „McCarthyisme” verwerp. Dit is vals omdat dit met „goedkoop slagspreuke soos „liberalisme”, „negrofilisme” en „Kommunisme”, die Christene en Christelike organisasies en tydskrifte „wat hul beywer vir „gelykberegtiging” op „suiwer Bybelse en Christelike” gronde vir „alle mense in Suid-Afrika”, „be-etiket”. Dit is 'n verregaande aantyging wat die eerste beginsel van Christelikheid mis, omdat hier geen konkrete getuïenis gelei word nie, maar 'n onverhoorde veroordeling gevel word. Bostaande beweringe moet wetenskaplik dokumentêr bewys word.

Hierdie ongemotiveerde valse aanklagte word met die „aksies” teen *Pro Veritate* en die Christelike Instituut sonder enige grondige bewys vereenselwig — kerklike opsig en straatpraatjies word dus gelykgeskakel — en as „paniekbevanging van persone en instansies” wat in „werklikheid nie teen die kommunisme” maar „teen die Kruis van Christus” veg, deur die skrywer gekwalifiseer. Die omstrede handelinge en standpunte van die Instituut word dus met die „Kruis van Christus” op 'n onwetenskaplike en on-teologiese wyse vereenselwig.

### (c) Die vraag

Op grond van bostaande „persoonlike oortuiging” word die belangrike vraag: „Waarheen is ons op pad” dan gestel en beantwoord. Die „manipulering van propagandategnieke” deur politieke leiers, Afrikaanse koerante, die S.A.U.K. sowel as die „eensydige en selfs onware berigte vanuit Suid-Afrika” stem die blanke bevolking „afwysend”, daarom is bostaande vraag vir „Kerk- en Christenleiers” van belang.

Voorts behandel die skrywer „die reaksies van kerkleiers” in die buiteland t.o.v. die „deursoeking” van die kantore en die kerklike optrede teen die Instituut. Sommige „kerkleiers” was „diep geskok” en ander was die sinnelose gedagte toegedaan dat ons in Suid-Afrika lankal in „wese 'n diktatuurstaat” is en dat die kerk nie meer „sy profetiese getuïenis” laat hoor nie. Dit word op die onbeholpe teologiese siening gebaseer, as sou die Sinodale Kommissie geen woord van „oortreding teen Skrif en belydenis” teen die Instituut geopper het nie. Dit spreek van 'n oppervlakkige vooroordeel en onbeholpenheid in die teologie wat skynbaar vir die skrywer normatief is.

want daarom word ons na buitelandse opinies verwys en bestaande vraag word nooit onomwonde beantwoord nie.

### (d) Die „Belydende Kerk”

In die lig van bostaande meen die skrywer om in die gang van sake „parallele . . . tussen die situasie van destydse Nazi-Duitsland en die huidige in Suid-Afrika” op te merk. Hierdie paralelle bestaan sowel in „die uitbuiting van slagspreuke in die pers en radio” as in „die algemene vreesreaksie” by lidmate en evangeliedienaars, wat „lei tot onhoudbare kompromisse of onduidbare stilswye” wat sonder twyfel die „mag van 'n politieke beheer” versterk. Die kerk en „kerkleiers” (wat 'n on-teologiese woordskepping) is dus besig om die waarheid te verloën en 'n politieke leuen aan te hang. Wat 'n geweldige sydelingse beskuldiging sonder enige konkrete en stawende getuïenis.

Hierdie haglike toestand bring die gedagte van 'n „Bekennende Kirche” volgens die mening van die skrywer na vore. Sonder om nou hierdie „Belydende Kerk” teologies en kerkregtelik te omlin, word die losse groep gelowiges „met groter liefde, erns en verantwoordelikheid” opgeroep om „ondubbelsinnige standpunte in te neem en 'n onbevreesde getuïenis te laat hoor op grond van Gods Woord.” Indien hierdie ondubbelsinnigheid van die ongemotiveerde vaaghede van die skrywer afhanklik moet wees, dan bejammer ek die sogenaamde „Belydende Kerk”. Die billike vraag moet hier gestel word: watter onbevreesde getuïenis moet hierdie super-geestelikes laat opklink? Dit is voorwaar 'n holle „slagspreuk”.

Voorts laat die skrywer op grond van bostaande onbeholpenheid in Skrif en teologie die wanhoopskreet hoor: „Sal God dan nie gee dat uit al hierdie gebeure meer gesante van God na vore sal tree” nie! D.w.s. hulle moet die amptelike roeping van God binne die kerk laat vaar en tot 'n menslike nie-amptelike stigting toetree. Die gesante van God word dus tot afvalligheid van die kerk en die belydenis opgeroep om aan die mens meer „gehoorsaamheid” te bewys. Dit is voorwaar 'n oproep tot afvalligheid van God se metodes van gemeentebou om aan 'n humanistiese skeurmakery meer gehoorsaamheid te bewys.

## (B) ONS BEOORDELING

Afgesien van die brokstukkies kritiek wat ons gaandeweg reeds gelewer het, word ons nou geroep om die omstrede artikel grondig te beoordeel.

### (a) Algemene kritiek

Die teologies-filosofiese onbeholpenheid van die skrywer drywe op die oppervlakte van sy onwetenskaplike metode van suggestiewe verdagmakery, vaaghede en versuim om konkrete getuïenis vir sy vergesogte afleiding te gee. Die skrywer kom niks verder as onbewese stelling en ongekwalifiseerde piëtistiese slagspreuke nie. Daarom word staatsplig en kerklike

(Vervolg op bladsy 15)

## Lambaréné's greatheart is dead

(Continued from page 6)

could be provided many lives might be saved and much suffering averted.

Back to his mind came the statue of the negro he had seen years before. And in that moment his decision was made.

He would go to Africa himself in person. With his own hands he would serve those hapless people. He would share their life, relieve their sufferings, live — and if need be, die — in an attempt to uplift and heal them.

He would not go as a missionary preacher. "It is no use preaching about a religion of love," he said; "they must see you practise it." He resolved to go as a doctor.

When the news of his decision reached his friends, they told him it was sheer madness. What, give up an atmosphere of culture and refinement and tradition and learning for the savage life of the primeval forest and steaming jungle? He must not do it.

But he was adamant. When they reminded him that he was going to one of the most unhealthy places in the world, where disease was rampant and death always round the corner, he simply replied, "All the more need for a doctor!"

They accused him of wasting his gifts and throwing away his great learning instead of using it to benefit the scholars of his day. They brought forward every argument they could think of to make him change his mind. It was all to no avail. He only kept repeating:

"It is something I must do. I cannot stop to count the cost. I **must** go."

He went. The dangers and horrors were all that his friends had threatened, but he seemed not to notice them. He was too filled with pity and compassion at the appalling sufferings of the primitive Africans, too absorbed with his work of helping and healing.

### PERSEVERANCE

There was no hospital at Lambaréné when he arrived, and he literally had to start from scratch. For a time he was overwhelmed. Leprosy, sleeping sickness, twisted and

broken limbs, famished children — they almost drove him to despair.

But gradually he brought order out of chaos. Those who would normally have died were saved, much suffering was relieved, and the Africans came both to trust and to love him.

Not that he did not almost give up many times. Once, ill himself and on the verge of a breakdown, he was in despair.

"What a fool I've been, ever to come here!" he cried out to one of his African assistants. The man looked at him through eyes filled with tears, and answered,

"Maybe you are a fool — on earth, but not in heaven."

So he persevered, and gradually saw the present hospital arise, with its modern equipment, fully qualified and adequate medical and surgical staff, its compound for infectious diseases.

At intervals he went to Europe and other parts of the world. He lectured, gave organ recitals to raise money for his beloved hospital, made gramophone records of the music of Bach and Cesar Franck.

Honours were heaped upon him. In Germany he received the much-prized Goethe award "for services to humanity." The University of Chicago gave him an honorary degree, as did the University of Prague. Everywhere he was commended for his great work.

Back at Lambaréné he began to build a new hospital for the ever-increasing number of lepers. While working on it he received an invitation to go to Oslo for the Nobel Peace Prize award. His reply was typical.

"My lepers must come first. I dare not leave here until they are provided for."

### PHILOSOPHY

Schweitzer describes his own philosophy as "reverence for life." Possessing a heart full of pity for suffering creatures, the least worm and insect of the universe was given the homage of his respect and compassion.

His decision to spend his life in Africa, puzzling to many, was to him the most natural thing in the world. He believed he owed a debt to God which could be repaid only by a lifetime of dedicated and sacrificial service. One of his biographers, Oscar Kraus in "Albert Schweitzer:

His Work and His Philosophy," makes this discerning appraisal of his motives.

"Schweitzer was the first to apply Jesus' parable of Dives and Lazarus not only to the individual but also to society as a whole . . . It was the Lord Jesus who bade Schweitzer and his wife to go to the banks of the Ogwe . . ."

"This is no empty figure of speech; it is literally a new Imitation of Christ which compels him to expiate the sin of the Western peoples (in their neglect of the suffering coloured races) by taking this cross upon himself."

The Doctor of Lambaréné was not without his critics. Like all great men, he has been studied, analysed, dissected and debunked by more than one writer. But somehow books written to disturb and destroy the image of the man which has come across to the world do not achieve their purpose. As a recent reviewer said, "It is Schweitzer who dominates the pages, and (the) onslaughts are seen as a mouselike nibbling at a fortress."

### HE LIVES ON

So Albert Schweitzer, dead in body, lives on. His impact on a world hardened by material considerations and often cynical towards religion will continue, for men know greatness and goodness when they see it.

Looking back over his life and work, we cannot mourn. We can only give thanks, remain humble and allow those great imponderable but essentially real considerations which motivated his words and actions to enter into our own thinking and living.

Writing of Schweitzer ten years ago in his book, "Christianity in Action," F. Addington Symonds said, "When the time comes for him to pass on to his reward, he will leave behind him a rich and abiding harvest and a name that must surely be added in letters of gold to those of that small but glorious company who have loved their God with all their hearts and their neighbours as themselves."

That prediction has been completely fulfilled. The 20th century world, with all its sins, sicknesses and sorrows, is a better world because Albert Schweitzer lived in it.

Can more be said of any man?

## Facing Judgment and Truth

(Continued from page 4)

evaded. It is my conviction (but apparently not Dr. Mes') that this prophetic message is extremely relevant to South Africa today. It is also, of course, relevant to Britain, China, America, and many other nations. But we live in South Africa; Pro Veritate is addressed to South Africa; and thus the relevance of the prophets for South Africa must be our special concern.

### UNDERSTANDING HOSEA AND DEUTERONOMY

Dr. Mes has criticised my interpretation of the Old Testament and my application of its message to South Africa. Unfortunately his understanding of the Biblical material is badly muddled.

To begin with Hosea (discussed in "The Rule of God and White Supremacy", April, 1965), Dr. Mes fails to see clearly that this prophet spoke to a community which had become so permeated by Canaanite attitudes and customs that this was in fact the prevailing "way of life". Further, Israel had mingled these religious patterns of Canaan with the worship of God in such a way that the two had become inseparable. Canaanite ways and the faith of Yahweh, God of Israel, were basically incompatible — but they had nevertheless been so fused together that a fundamental betrayal of God had taken place. Hosea insisted that because of this betrayal Israel would be judged and destroyed.

Dr. Mes is decidedly wrong when he suggests that Hosea urged Israel to "close their ranks against the Gentiles", and "practise almost total segregation." There were hardly any "Gentiles" in Israel in the eighth century; Hosea was criticising the paganism of his fellow Israelites, not of foreigners. The Canaanite people had long since either been destroyed or absorbed into Israel. Hosea attacked the Canaanite religion which had survived and become popular in Israel, not integration with Canaanite people. The question of Jewish "segregation" from Gentile did not arise until the Babylonian Exile (a century and a half after Hosea) when the Jews were surrounded by pagan peoples and afraid that their

religion might perish. Furthermore, Dr. Mes and others should note that Ezra, Nehemiah and others in that later post-exilic Jewish community preached separation from foreigners for RELIGIOUS reasons. They were concerned not to preserve a race or a nation or a culture, but a FAITH. Their logic was much the same as that of modern Christians who oppose the marriage of Christian and non-Christian, or Roman Catholic and non-Catholic, for fear

that the religion will not continue in the children. If one were to apply this logic to South Africa there would be no justification whatever for racial segregation: for there are more non-white Christians in this country than there are white, and the Bible teaches the complete integration of all members of the people of God!

To turn to Deuteronomy (dis-

(Continued on page 12)

(Vervolg van bladsy 5)

gesag!" „Die Heilige Gees en ons het besluit!" Die kerk weet ook waarmee hy te doen het as 'n geheime politieke organisasie sy invloed wil laat geld om 'n Kerkraad, Ring of Sinode aan homself en sy verordeninge meer mag en gesag te laat toeskryf as aan die Woord van God. Die kerk weet wat hom bedreig as daar, van buite af of vanuit sy eie midde, by hom aangedring word om diegene te vervolg wat heilig lewe en hom oor sy „gebreke, gierigheid en afgodery" bestraf. Dit is die leuenevangelie wat sy vrugte dra.

In Suid-Afrika het nog 'n faktor van ter syde op die toneel gekom: die Christelike Instituut van Suidelike Afrika — 'n vereniging van Christene wat die kerk lief het en wie se harte daarvoor brand dat alleen die gesag van Christus in sy kerk sal geld en dat sy Koninkryk deur almal erken sal word. Die vloeke en vervloekinge wat daar teen hierdie Instituut geslinger word, moet die kerk tot aandag roep: Sekte; muitery; geheime organisasie; spreekbuis van Engelse geestelikes wat gehoop het dat hulle 'n nuwe middel gevind het vir die ou verdeel- en heerspolitiek; ens. ens. Wie maar enigsins met die Christelike Instituut bekend is, staan verslae daaroor, maar hoef ook nie na 'n verklaring te soek nie. 'n Boom word aan sy vrugte geken. 'n Leuenevangelie ook. Die beswadering van die Christelike Instituut is vir die kerk in Suid-Afrika 'n openbaring van met wie en waarmee hy te doen het.

Die kerk in ons land is met sy eer in die smeltkroes. Sal hy gelouter daar uitkom as draer van die waarheid? Ja — want hy is die Kerk van Christus!

(Continued from page 5)

ful claim, "Authority of Christ"! "The Holy Spirit and we have resolved"! The Church also knows with what it has to deal when a secret political organisation endeavours to make its influence prevail in Church councils, circuits or synods, in order to obtain for itself and its enactments a power and an authority greater than that of the Word of God. The Church knows the nature of that which threatens it when, from without and from within its own circles, the demand is made to persecute those who live holy lives and who chastise it for its "failure, selfishness and idolatry". It is a pseudo-gospel which is bearing its fruit.

In South Africa another factor has surprisingly appeared on the scene: the Christian Institute of Southern Africa — an association of Christians who love the Church, who fervently desire that only the authority of Christ will obtain in the Church and who long that His Kingdom will be acknowledged by all. The curses which are flung at this Institute must call the Church to attention: Sectarian, mutiny, secret organization, mouthpiece of the English clerics who had hoped to find a new method for the old divide-and-rule politics; etc., etc. Those who have had even the slightest contact with the Institute are non-plussed by this, but need not search for an explanation, for a tree is known by its fruit. A "gospel of the lie" also. The smearing of the Christian Institute is a revelation to the Church in South Africa of the nature of those with whom and that with which it is confronted.

The Church in our country and its honour is in the melting-pot. Will it emerge purified as the bearer of the truth? Yes — because it is Christ's Church.

## Facing Judgment and Truth

(Continued from page 11)

cussed in "The Land is God's"), Mes criticises me because I begin my discussion of the Biblical view of the land at the point at which Israel was already in possession of Palestine. He asks why I do not go back to the time when Israel conquered Palestine with the blessing of God; surely, he says, "if God 'gave' the land to the Israelites what is wrong with the idea that God 'gave' South Africa to the Whites . . .?"

This is a very common but very dangerous distortion of the meaning of Scripture. The Old Testament insists that God gave the land of Palestine to Israel because the Hebrews were his specially **chosen people** (see, e.g., Deut. 7:6-8; 26:5-9). He set them apart from "all the families of the earth" for a special task, and in order to fulfil his purpose through them he fought for them in the Conquest of Palestine.

**It does NOT, however, follow that when Afrikaners fought for land in South Africa, or English in America, or Dutch in the East Indies, God was fighting for them, giving them the land. For these nations are not the chosen people of God! Immense harm has been done by nations which have claimed to be God's chosen people when they were not. (One need only think of Nazi Germany).** Scripture insists that only one nation in history, Israel, has been specially chosen: "You only have I known (chosen) of all the families of the earth . . ." (Amos 3:2). The Church, the heir of Israel, the new chosen people, is not a nation; and when Christians (who are chosen by God) claim that their nation or race is also thus chosen, they are wrong.

Once Israel was in possession of the land of Palestine, the prophetic understanding of God's requirements concerning the land and of Israel's responsibility to God for its use becomes profoundly relevant to South Africa and many other peoples. But you cannot work back from the Biblical requirements concerning the land, and claim that if these obligations apply, so does the belief that God fought for Israel to gain the land. The ethic which grows out of Israel's theology of election is, as I have sought to show,

applicable to Christians and to others. But the identification of one nation, Israel, as God's chosen people remains unique and cannot be extended to any modern nation.

### THE INTERPRETATION OF SOUTH AFRICAN LIFE

It is very evident that Dr. Mes rejects my interpretation of Scripture primarily because he rejects my evaluation of South Africa. While he quarrels with my analysis of the Bible, he simply scorns my assessment of South Africa without really coming to grips with it. He dodges the issue of whether or not white South Africa's way of life, based as it is (and as he admits) on white supremacy and segregation, is evil and in conflict with the will of God. He refuses to face the truth that white land policies, exploiting as they do the non-white population, are immoral. He claims that I have **both** failed to give evidence of white mistreatment of black, **and** that I am too unrestrained in my discussion of that mistreatment: he is apparently unaware that he thus contradicts himself, or perhaps he has failed to read my discussion of freehold rights, Group Areas, and white militarism and complacency.

**One who has thus committed himself to the policy of white supremacy appears unable to tolerate any attempt to bring Scripture to bear upon that policy.**

My disagreement with Mes on South Africa is so complete that I would not weary the reader by disputing all of his statements about this country. Let me simply call attention to two particularly glaring errors in his thinking.

Mes objects to my condemnation of segregation in South Africa by pointing out that segregation has been practised elsewhere in the world. One does get rather tired of this fallacious argument: that just because segregation can be found elsewhere, South Africa is not so bad. In one breath so many whites will defend segregation as right and also point to Little Rock or Smethwick to show that they are not the only sinners. Does the fact that another man commits murder justify my committing it also? It is wrong, wherever it is done. Segregation and racial prejudice are of course worldwide phenomena. But white South Africa is unique, as Mes himself tacitly admits, in that such prejudice is so built into the fabric of its life

that you cannot remove it without destroying the whole. Segregation has become synonymous with our "way of life", and to forsake the former is to betray the latter. Not even in the American South is this the case today — South Africa is unique.

The familiar claim that tribal Africans did not "own" land is also made by Dr. Mes. Of course the tribal Africans did not practice individual land ownership of the European type. But whether it belonged to the individual or the tribe, it was their land. Furthermore, today many Africans — including Kaiser Matanzima, it would appear — have no desire to return to the old tribal patterns of land ownership which are now irrelevant. They claim, quite rightly, that in the modern world the only effective means of land ownership is freehold title: and in his denial of such title to them, Dr. Verwoerd admits the truth of their claim. To argue that Africans never had individual freehold title before the white man came is simply to evade the obvious justice of their demands.

### MERCY AND JUDGMENT

Is it Christian to emphasise the judgment of an evil nation? Dr. Mes implies that it is not. He contrasts "Old Testamentary invective" with our "gentle Master" who taught the love of all men. He appeals to the "pity and the salvation which Jesus offers to sinners . . ." And he thereby reveals a radical misunderstanding of both Old and New Testaments.

In the Bible mercy and judgment are not opposites, the one Christian and the other Jewish. In both Old and New Testaments mercy and judgment go together. The God of Israel loves his people with a tender and forgiving love; and the divine love is reflected in the prophets' love for their nation. But precisely because of his love God will not and cannot ignore the evil which is destroying the nation's relationship with him. In his love for his people he judges them, he punishes them, that they may learn his ways and return to him. And sometimes the nation's evil becomes so great that the judgment must be very heavy. But nearly always (there are a few exceptions) the judgment is the only way through to hope — on the other side of the judgment a new beginning may be possible. Judgment is God's love acting to teach and to

convert his people. It is no accident that Deuteronomy and Hosea contain both some of the most tender passages on the love of God in the Bible, and also some of the most terrible pictures of judgment. They belong together.

And Jesus himself, who was Love incarnate, could speak words of judgment far sterner than any Old Testament prophet. He loved his people, he lived and died for them because he loved them, but this did not deter him from declaring God's judgment upon their evil (see, e.g., Matt. 23; Mark 11:12-14). The "pity and the salvation which Jesus offers sinners" has no meaning unless we see our sin and repent. Nor does the love of God mean that he ceases to judge and punish those whom he loves.

"... the work that each man does will at last be brought to light; the day of judgement will expose it. For that day dawns in fire, and the fire will test the worth of each man's work."

— 1 Corinthians 3:13.

Because God cares, he judges, that such judgment may bring men to repentance and salvation.

### TRUTH AND UNITY

At both the beginning and the end of his remarks Mes appeals for unity and asserts that my writing does harm to that unity. He opens with the statement that *Pro Veritate* exists "to foster and, in some ways, to represent the essential spiritual unity of the Christian Church." "... the role of mediator (he goes on to say) needs infinite care and tact, rather than single-minded devotion and a knowing that one is right."

I have never imagined that *Pro Veritate* exists to serve as mediator between the different opinions in South African Christendom, although this is for the editors to say. This journal has, I hope, a higher calling even than that. Certainly Christians in South Africa do have a higher calling than that of tactfully persuading their fellows to unite. (In any case Mes does not want real unity among all Christians of all races, for he defends segregation. Or does he perhaps speak of "spiritual unity" in order to avoid the task of becoming united in a concrete and personal way with his black brethren?)

**The first task of Christians in this land is to face the truth — the truth of God and the truth about themselves. For real unity in Christ can**

**only come through the Truth which is Christ. Unless we are willing fearlessly to seek the truth and to tell it to others, we can go no farther in understanding or in unity.** Again, this was the task of the prophets — to declare to their people the truth of God and the truth about their own evil. And the fact that the people were truly evil and refused to repent — that they would not face the truth and act upon it — meant that God's truth for them was neither pity nor unity, but destruction and dispersion over the face of the earth.

If there is to be unity in divided

South Africa — unity among all Christians and unity among all men of whatever colour — then we must begin where the title of this journal summons us to begin — with *Veritas*, truth. If Dr. Mes can demonstrate that I have not spoken the truth, either about the Scriptures or about South Africa, then he is justified in criticising my writing. But we cannot appeal for the mercy or the unity of the God who loves us all, black and white, unless we are willing to live with the truth of our evil, to accept the judgment we deserve, and to begin to serve the Lord.

## Readers' Views

### "THE LAND IS GOD'S"

Dear Sir,

Since a discussion has already arisen from Mr. Myrick's article in your July issue, I beg leave to offer the following very brief comments.

FIRST: Any article which implies that South African White men are morally different from others is deeply fallacious. As Mr. Mes pointed out, all White communities have behaved in essentially the same way when they have shared a territory with non-white communities. This has not been an expression of mere brutality; it has been a consequence of the facts of their history. In the far East (China), in India, Egypt, and America, the fair-skinned conquerors have been conscious of a long tradition of civilization not shared by the darker skinned people in the region. Thus we find that it is only where, and when, the White community has been certain of its economic and cultural security that it has relaxed its "baasskap" attitude towards non-whites.

SECOND: The situation now obtaining with respect to ownership of land is not the consequence of high-minded ethical decisions by our ancestors, and we should not attempt to justify it morally. Neither should we attempt to make present-day decisions by considering what our ancestors might have done if they had been Franciscan missionaries. We have to face the situation and the people of 1965, not those of 1765.

THIRD: Historical studies of the growth of our nation to its present state define only the place from which we have to move forward; they do not indicate a direction.

FOURTH: For any Christian there can be only two morally acceptable possibilities for our nation of many ethnic groups. (i) It should be utterly destroyed and a new system of separate territories each inhabited by one ethnic group should be arranged. (ii) It should provide equal opportunities for all its members irrespective of race.

As we know, there is an idealistic (their own word) group which insists that the first must, at any cost, be achieved. That there would be needed terrible sacrifices, and that some families would experience appalling suffering, is

not denied. But it is felt that this generation and its immediate successors must endure these pains for the sake of posterity. Those of us who disagree do so because we do not believe that the White group will willingly make the sacrifices required for a just solution on those lines. History provides no example of a privileged group which willingly relinquished its position of privilege. Karl Marx said that, but it remains true whoever said it.

A number of South Africans advocate the second possibility. This too would entail a period of mental and physical suffering, but almost certainly much less than the first. However, it is rejected by many because it would probably result in a certain amount of miscegenation. It seems, then, that no solution acceptable to Christians is also acceptable to the mass of South African Whites. This I believe to be the case.

On the other hand, Mr. Myrick's emphasis on land hunger seems to me to be anachronistic. Only a small minority in any civilized nation can own appreciable areas of land. In peasant communities, there is no distinction between land hunger and home hunger, but I am convinced that the latter, not the former, is the basic human emotion. Where normal individuals are denied the possibility of a stable home life, during the years of retirement as well as those of earning, the community is in a state of explosive disintegration. That, surely, and not some concept of peasant farming analogous to Old Testament life, is what Christians must consider.

Rev. (Dr.) D. W. Bandy,  
5, Gilbert Street,  
Grahamstown.

Dear Sir,

In the July issue of *Pro Veritate*, Mr. Myrick in his article "The Land is God's", seems to do the cause he seeks to serve great harm because of his one-sidedness, lack of objectivity and consequent throwing away of integrity. As a citizen of the U.S.A. Mr. Myrick should be aware of the exploitation of the Red Indians, how they were driven off the land and how they are now confined to limited reserves. The Red Indians were decimated by ruthless early settlers and this is often the subject of Hollywood films. Much the same took place in all countries settled by White men,

e.g. Australia and New Zealand, but, while in the U.S.A. and Australia the indigenous population was reduced to almost nothing, in South Africa the White man's care caused the population of indigenous people to increase. It is therefore difficult to see why all the examples given in the articles are taken from South Africa or the people of Israel and not from the U.S.A. Has the latter no "terrible guilt"?

Why does the writer not emphasise the Continent-wide abuse of the land by the Bantu for many generations, in that they overworked the land and then passed on to more virgin territories until they had, in like manner robbed them of their fertility? Why is there no mention of the great reserves in South Africa, the Transkei, Zululand and others, where no White man owns land and large portions of which would have been deserts before now but for the Government's measures to protect it from African wastefulness?

The article gives the impression that the reserves are barren and useless. As a South African agriculturist I can say that there is no better land in South Africa than the Transkei and Zululand. It has tremendous agricultural potential, is well watered and fertile and has not been developed to any extent. The African population would be well advised to put their own house in order, agriculturally speaking, before asking bitterly why they should not own thousands of acres like the White man. Let them prove that they are capable of looking after their own land first. As in most continents the Eastern seaboard is the best watered and most fertile, e.g. the U.S.A., Australia and Africa and it is in this area that the Transkei, Ciskei and Zululand fall. 50% or more of South Africa is desert or semi-desert-land owned by Whites and this fact is conveniently overlooked by the writer as well as the fact that the "tiny minority" referred to, is an area  $5\frac{1}{2}$  times the size of Belgium. There must be exceptions to the rule, but I have yet to see an African farmer applying modern technology in his farming methods.

And finally I would challenge Mr. Myrick to give facts supporting his statement that because of the White man's plunder of millions of acres of land from Africans who owned it he stands condemned before God.

H. J. D. Matthews,  
P.O. Box 14,  
Alice.

Sir,

P. Allen Myrick in his article, "The Land is God's" (*Pro Veritate*, IV, 3), provides us with a good illustration of the I-am-holier-than-thou attitude we in South Africa have become so used to expect from clergymen from abroad. The Reverend Myrick presumably has not heard of the Christian virtue charity, or of Christ's reply to the Pharisees about casting the first stone.

In his first paragraph Mr. Myrick makes some sweeping generalising statements which aptly demonstrate his ignorance of South African history. These statements are not based on facts, but suit this gentleman's peculiar brand of logic.

The author declares that land hunger drove the colonists to carve out huge farms "and kill or enslave any native inhabitants who stood in their way." Firstly, the statement is too vague and denies the possibility that any other fac-

tors might have been at work. Moreover, the Great Trek had causes more complex than Mr. Myrick would care to admit. For lack of space I cannot mention more than that it did not have only *one* cause, and that the Voortrekkers did not *all* trek for the same reasons. Those living on the eastern frontier, for instance, moved because of circumstances vastly different from those living in the Colesberg district, for example. (If Mr. Myrick is interested, I shall be perfectly willing to supply him with a list of historical works and articles which might assist him in gaining a better perspective of South African history.) Secondly, to maintain that the colonists *killed or enslaved* any native inhabitants which stood in their way is completely incorrect. Upon what historical grounds does Mr. Myrick base his statement? The reverend gentleman does not seem to know much about the *two* population migrations which had moved towards each other, and, when meeting, had created problems which are all too easily solved in retrospect. Unfortunately there were obstacles to solving these problems over which the colonists had very little control: an uninformed and (often) unsympathetic government separated by thousands of miles from South Africa, laying down policies the only consistent characteristic of which was vacillation. Then, what about the movement of native tribes down the east coast of Africa which eventually reached the present Eastern Province — would Mr. Myrick explain it by saying that the natives have had "an almost insatiable hunger for land"?

The argument about native inhabitants being enslaved has no foundation. Domestic slavery existed at the Cape, but the slaves were imported from outside South Africa — in most cases from outside Africa. All slaves in the British Empire were emancipated in 1834. (In the U.S.A. this came only a generation later). If any native inhabitants had been enslaved after 1834, can Mr. Myrick please tell us the date of their emancipation?

If the land in South Africa belong to God, to whom does it belong in, say, North America where Mr. Myrick's home country is? Has he ever thought about the Red Indians and the land they used to occupy? Does he know how the "Indian problem" has been solved in the United States of America? A few quotations will illustrate what has been done in that country. According to an American president:

*The Indians were the original occupants of the lands we now possess. They have been driven from place to place. The purchase money paid to them in some cases for what they called their own has still left them poor. In many instances, when they had settled down upon lands assigned to them by compact and begun to support themselves by their own labor, they were rudely jostled off and thrust into the wilderness again. Many, if not most, of our Indian wars have had their origin in broken promises and acts of injustice on our part.*

Between 1887 and 1906 the U.S. government disposed of 75 million acres, i.e. about *three-fifths* of the entire land which had been set aside for the Indians. Fifty million acres of this land was sold to white settlers. By 1900 the U.S.A. had

"solved" the problem to such an extent that there were only about half as many Red Indians as in 1492, when the white man's contact with America was first established. Their condition, however, was far different; in the words of the eminent American historian Harold Faulkner: "Desperately poor, scourged by the white man's diseases, and easily exploited by the dominant race, they were in an unenviable position." In Canada the treatment of the Indians and their land has hardly been different.

Mr. Myrick says: "Because of the white man's ruthless plunder of millions of acres of land from the Africans who owned it, he stands condemned before God." Has he considered that if "American Indian" were substituted for "African", he himself as a white American stands condemned before God? What has he done to exonerate himself and other Americans from this condemnation?

The following is an instance of the methods employed — as late as the 1860's when the power of the Indians were finally broken — by the grandfathers of Mr. Myrick's generation of Americans. An eye-witness describes an incident where a tribe of between 500 and 600 persons was treacherously attacked and wiped out, the American soldiers sparing neither men, women, nor children:

*They were scalped, their brains knocked out; the men used their knives, ripped open women, clubbed little children, knocked them with their guns, beat their brains out, mutilated their bodies in every sense of the word.*

Another eye-witness says: "In going over the battle-ground next day I did not see a body of man, woman, or child but was scalped, and in many instances their bodies were mutilated in the most horrible manner — men, women, and children's privates cut out." I challenge Mr. Myrick to supply a better illustration of "the godless policy of white supremacy"! Why does he not hang his head in shame and try and get the Americans to give back God's land (in this case at least the whole Middle and Far West!) to the 400,000 Indians surviving today?

Mr. Myrick mentions "the ruthless destruction of Sophiatown" by a "cynical" South African government. What does he know about Sophiatown? Does he know that Sophiatown had been one of the worst slum areas in South Africa? In certain books condemning South Africa, photographs of Sophiatown have even been used to illustrate conditions in this country! Reading Mr. Myrick's lament, however, one might easily be led to believe that it had been something quite different.

One may wonder what purpose Mr. Myrick had in mind when he penned his peculiar blend of half-truths. If he had wanted to make a genuine contribution towards the solution of the problem (and we are in need of such contributions), he would surely have approached it differently, and perhaps in a more humble and Christianlike way. It seems, however, as if prejudice and ignorance are the fruits by which certain Christians are being known today.

Jan Pretorius,  
Department of History,  
University College,  
P.O. For Hare, C.P.

(Vervolg van bladsy 9)

opsig sommer uit die staanspoor verwar. Die deursoeking van die kantore van die Instituut is 'n staatsplig wat vandag in die hele wêreld in gebruik is, maar dis slegs in Suid-Afrika 'n Nazi-metode, en dit het niks te maak met die Bybels-genormeerde opsig wat die kerk teen die Instituut beoefen nie. Die sondige groepvorming, geloofsverdeeldheid en verwarring as bevinding en beoordeling van kerklike kant, word nie aan die lesers van Pro Veritate meegedeel nie. Die rede is voor die hand liggend, want daar bestaan geen Skrif- of belydenisgronde vir die bestaan en arbeid van die Instituut nie. Dit is 'n totale on-Bybelse stigting van die mens wat die Here se Stigting, die Kerk, met 'n skeurmakende ideologie, gelykberegtiging as politieke slagspreuk, wil verdeel.

#### (b) Kommunisme verwerp

Die skrywer slaag beslis nie daarin om dokumentêre getuienis aan die lesers voor te lê dat die Instituut deur kerk en staat van kommunistiese metodes en leerstellinge beskuldig word nie. Dit kan tog nie bloot uit die ondersoek bewys word nie. Dit is 'n blote stelling wat met 'n herhaalde ontkenning weerlê word.

Die aanklag wat die skrywer grondig moet weerlê, moet in die aftakelingsproses deur die Instituut, die nivellering en relativering van ons belydenis, die humanisties-liberalistiese verwerping van kerklike gesag en die verstreming van politiek en godsdiens gesoek word. Hierdie aftakelingsproses is die wegbereiding vir die sosialistiese materialisme, want die ongekwalifiseerde slagspreuk van „gelykberegtiging” met sy ondubbelsinnige godsdiensintegrasie is ook vir die kommunisme aanneemlik.

#### (c) Liberale stigtings

Beide stigtings is onteenseglik liberaal, want dit ontken die kerklike gesag as bepaalde Christus-gesag sonder om enige reformatoriese getuienis voor 'n kerkvergadering met regeermag te bepleit. Die kerklike gesag word op individualistiese grondslag verwerp, die belydenisverskille, onversoerbare verskille, word genivelleer en geloofseenheid word op humanistiese grondslag met „saam-wees” vereenselwig. Dit gee 'n soort van integrasiegodsdiens wat kerk, staat en maatskappy ondermyn om so die vyfde gebod sowel as die Heidelbergse Kategismus te oortree en 'n bepaalde Bybelgesag te elimineer. Hierdie alombekende aanklag teen die Instituut en Pro Veritate is beslis nie deur die skrywer weerlê nie. Ons wag nie alleen tevergeefs op die gemotiveerde bestaansreg van beide stigtings volgens Skrif en belydenis nie, maar ons wag ook vir die skriftuurlike verwerping van die sinodale gesag.

#### (d) Nazistiese paralelle

Die vermeende Nazistiese paralelle wat die skrywer noem, kom in alle lande ter wêreld voor, daarom moet die wêreld saam met Suid-Afrika na Nazi-Duitsland oorhel.

Die wetenskaplike kenner is daarvan bewus dat die verdwene Nazi-Duitsland met sy vergoddelike nasionaal-sosialistiese magstaat, wat nasionale volkseenhede op imperialistiese basis oorwoeker het, geen vergelyking met die Christelike nasionale regstaat, wat prakties honder-

de miljoene rande op staatkundige en godsdiensgebied bestee om onbeskaafde volkseenhede tot beskaafde nasionale eenhede te lei, in Suid-Afrika het nie. Dit is 'n totale misvatting wat 'n gevaarlike teologies-staatsfilosofiese onvermoë huisves. Die gehate Suid-Afrika met sy Bybelse beleid van differensiasie en eiesoortigheid bou met behulp van ons Christelike offervaardigheid nasionale eenhede terwyl Nazi-Duitsland nasionale eenhede uitgewis het.

#### (e) Waarheen op pad

Die groot vraag is daarop bereken om die agterdog te wek, as sou Suid-Afrika netsoos gewese Nazi-Duitsland die kerk sosialisties verstaatlik het en die profetiese roeping van die kerk aan 'n politieke ideologie diensbaar gemaak het. Dit is 'n onpatriotiese voorstelling wat op geen waarheidsgrond berus nie.

Die vaaghede en ongemotiveerde veralgemenings maak dit moeilik om die artikel deurtastend te weerlê, want die stawende getuienis wat deur die skrywer voorgelê is, is uiters skraal. Dit is 'n blote sameflansing van „ek” sê en verdraaide gebeurtenisse. Dit is 'n jammerlike gebrek aan leierskap.

#### (f) Belydenis Kerk

Die verbitterde siening wat in die langverwagte „nuwe” kerk deur hierdie onbekookte artikel moes uitmond, het niks verder gekom as verdagmakery nie. Die „Belydende Kerk” word by gebrek aan onderlegdheid nêrens wetenskaplik-kerkregtelik omlyn nie, daarom is opbouende

kritiek onmoontlik. Tog wil dit implisiet aan die wêreld vertel dat die kerklike situasie in Suid-Afrika so onherstelbaar verduister is, dat 'n reformatoriese getuienis slegs deur 'n nie-kerklike stigting soos die verdwene „Bekennende Kirche” van buite op die verstarde kerk afgedwing kan word. Die eindresultaat van die „groot” artikel het niks verder as 'n onkundige napratery gekom nie. Dit is geen teologiese of reformatoriese of filosofiese of wetenskaplike studievrug nie.

#### SLOTBEVINDING

In die geheel genome is die artikel: Die tyd vir 'n Belydende Kerk is daar, maar net 'n onbeholpe vrug van 'n bevooroordeelde mens wat diep verbitterd en teleurgesteld is. Dit is maar net die resultaat van 'n on-Bybelse integrasiegodsdiens wat in sy aprioristiese wortel tot geen wetenskapsvorming in staat is nie, omdat die Bybelse beginsel van differensiasie in al sy konsekwensies, ook in die heiligdom van die Here, opsetlik uit die gesigveld uitgelaat word. Dit is 'n onbewuste diensbaarheid aan die gelykheidsdogma van die humanistiese materialistiese sosialisme wat die kerk van Christus in 'n politieke stryd oor die wêreld betrek het. Dit is 'n visielose onvermoë wat „parallele” sien waar daar geen paralelle is nie, wat die kerklike situasie in Suid-Afrika gerieflikheids-halwe verkeerd lees, omdat die „Bekennende Kirche” in Duitsland met 'n geïntegreerde politieke kerk in S.A. nageboots moet word. Die tyd vir 'n Belydende Kerk ontbreek beslis.

## NOODSAAKLIKE VOORLOPIGE OPMERKINGS VAN DIE REDAKSIE

Ds. C. F. B. Naudé sal in die November-uitgawe van PRO VERITATE antwoord op hierdie artikel van ds. van Loggerenberg. Ons wou graag ds. van Loggerenberg se artikel onveranderd plaas, maar ons was verplig om enkele sinne wat lasterlik was, te skrap. Ons sou die artikel ook graag sonder enige redaksionele kommentaar wou plaas en dit aan die skrywer en aan ds. Naudé wou oorlaat om hulle ten aanhore van ons lesers teenoor mekaar uit te praat oor die vraag of die tyd vir 'n „belydende kerk” in Suid-Afrika aangebreek het of nie. **Ons sou egter ons plig versuim as ons hierdie artikel sonder enige byskrif die wêreld instuur. Die redaksie van PRO VERITATE distansieer hom geheel en al van die gesindheid wat daarin weerspieël word. Die eintlike onderwerp kom nouliks ter sprake. Die skrywer laat blyk dat hy nie weet wat die „Bekennende Kirche” destyds in Duitsland was wat ds. Naudé geïnspireer het tot die menings wat hy uitgespreek het nie. Maar daarvoor sal ds. Naudé self in sy antwoord breedvoeriger praat. Wat egter te betreur is, is dat ds. van Loggerenberg, terwyl die SAAK wat ter sprake is klaarblyklik, geoordeel aan die inhoud van sy artikel, buite die veld van sy kennis en beoordeling lê, oorgaan tot 'n aanval op die PERSOON van ds. Naudé. Ons ag dit onbillik en onregverdig, en hoe welkom ds. van Loggerenberg ookal is om sy menings in PRO VERITATE te lug, ons sal nie weer toelaat dat die ruimte van ons**

**blad op hierdie wyse misbruik word nie.** Ook die feit dat ds. van Loggerenberg meteens die geleentheid misbruik om 'n aanval te doen op ons blad en op die Christelike Instituut van Suidelike Afrika, en hom daarby bedien van argumente waarvan sommige nie met die feite strook nie en waarvan ander met 'n pretensie van „gereformeerde” insig opgewerp word wat 'n uiters ongereformeerde beskouing verrai, noop ons om, veral ter wille van lesers wat nie lede van die Christelike Instituut is nie, voorlopig te antwoord op sekere aantygings van die skrywer teen die Instituut.

(i) Deur ds. van Loggerenberg word aangevoer dat daar **geen Skrif- en belydenisgronde is vir die bestaan van die Christelike Instituut nie.** Bedoel hy dat 'n vereniging soos die Christelike Instituut deur die Bybel voorgeskryf sou moes wees as dit aanspraak wou maak op reg van bestaan? **Wat sal dan alles uiteindelik onder die oordeel moet val dat dit onbybels is? Ons wil nie eers probeer opnoem nie . . .** Maar met so 'n beskuldiging is niemand ook geholpe nie. Ds. van Loggerenberg sal vir ons moet sê waar of hoe 'n organisasie soos die Christelike Instituut teen die Bybel ingaan of deur die Bybel verbied word.

(ii) Ds. van Loggerenberg praat van „die aftakelingsproses” van die Instituut. **Wat het die Instituut al ooit afgetakel, behalwe dat hy hom sonder enige twyfel wil beywer vir die aftakeling van vreemde magte wat die Kerk van Christus in Suid-Afrika binnedring?**

Maar is die Instituut dan daarvoor verwerplik? Verdien hy nie juis daarom die steun van elke ware gelowige nie?

(iii) Ds. van Loggerenberg beskuldig die Instituut van „sondige groeppvorming, geloofsverdeeldeheid en verwarring” en beroep hom daarvoor op ’n „bevinding en beoordeling van kerklike kant”. Ons dra geen kennis van so ’n kerklike bevinding nie. Immers, die Instituut wag en pleit nog steeds dat die Ned. Geref. Kerk hom moet ondersoek en beoordeel. **As daar ooit so ’n kerklike bevinding mag kom soos dié wat ds. van Loggerenberg vooruitloop, sonder dat ’n behoorlike ondersoek (wat ook samesprekings sal moet insluit) daaraan voorafgegaan het — en ons het alle vrymoedigheid om dit te sê — sal dit nie die Kerk wees nie, maar ’n politieke element wat op so ’n tydstip in ’n kerklike vergadering die oorhand het.** Alle veroordelende uitsprake wat daar tot dusver, amptelik en nie-amptelik, oor die Christelike Instituut gedoen is, het nie berus op feite i.v.m. die grondslag, doelstellinge en arbeid van die Instituut nie, maar op die goedkoop en tog gevaarlike venyn van sekere Afrikaanse politieke koerante en op „straatpraatjies” (om ds. van Loggerenberg se uitdrukking te gebruik) waarin uitdrukkings soos „skeurmakery”, „relativering en nivellering van ons belydenis”, „humanisties-liberalistiese verwerping van kerklike gesag”, ens. veelvuldig gehoor word. Rondom die Christelike Instituut het daar ’n hele klomp „geleerde” (!) vloekwoorde ontstaan.

Dit is eenmaal ONWAAR dat die Instituut skeuring wil veroorsaak, dat dit in sy opset lê, dat „skeurmakery” sy „ideologie” is. Die teendeel is waar en dit word deur sy konstitusie sowel as deur die feite (o.m. deur die vrug op sy arbeid) bevestig. Dit is tog sekerlik nie billik om die Instituut die skuld te gee vir wat sekere politieke koerante besig is om te doen en waarin hulle blykbaar die steun van sommige van die predikante van die Ned. Geref. Kerk geniet nie. **Lê die probleem nie by die geheime Broederbond-organisasie waarvan so baie predikante lede is nie? Waar kom die georganiseerde en sistematiese leuenveldtog teen die Christelike Instituut vandaan? Waarom word daar ook van kerklike kant so konsekwent geweier om die Christelike Instituut te ondersoek of sy direkteur aan te hoor? Kan vrede en eensgesindheid, kan die liefde met ’n opeenstapeling van onwaarhede gedien word?**

(iv) Ds. van Loggerenberg beskuldig die Instituut dat dit **belydenis-verskille nivelleer**. Dit is ’n ongegronde beskuldiging. Lidmaatskap van die Instituut doen geen afbreuk aan die trou van enige lid aan sy kerk en belydenis nie. **Wat wel waar is, is dat die Instituut hom stel op die standpunt dat geen natuurlike of kerklik-godsdiensige verskille wat daar tussen gelowiges mag bestaan, so groot is dat hulle nie meer met mekaar kan praat, na mekaar kan luister, kan probeer om mekaar te verstaan en mekaar lief te hê nie.** Bowendien beweeg die Instituut hom nie op ’n amptelik-kerklike vlak waar enige beslissings oor die belydenis van kerke geneem word nie.

(v) Ook die beskuldiging dat die Instituut „ons” (die gereformeerde) **belydenis relativer**, is ongegrond. Wat wel waar is, is dat die Instituut deur die blote feit van sy bestaan — en dit is een van

die redes vir sy ontstaan — van ’n suiwer gereformeerde waarheid getuig, nl. dat **die kerk deur die Woord en Gees van God geregeer word (en nie deur ’n geheime politieke organisasie nie)**. En deur sy arbeid wil die Instituut ’n ewe suiwer gereformeerde waarheid dien, nl. dat die kerk nie alléén die Woord van God kan hoor en dit alléén onfeilbaar uitspreek nie, maar dat ook die gelowiges die Skrif in hul hande het, die wil van God daaruit kan te wete kom en met die kerk mag mee-sprek en mee-oordeel. Een van die grootste leemtes in ons volkslewe is ongetwyfeld die gebrek aan kennis van die wil van God en die onkunde en onsekerheid oor wat Hy waarlik in sy Woord aan ons voorhou.

(vi) Daar is ook geen sprake van dat die Christelike Instituut skuldig sou wees aan ’n „humanisties-liberalistiese” **verwerping van kerklike gesag** nie. Ds. van Loggerenberg laat wel blyk dat hy nog ’n herinnering oorgehou het dat die enigste gesag in die kerk dié van Christus is. Waar kom hy dan tog daaraan dat die Instituut die gesag van Christus, die gesag van sy Woord, verwerp? **Wat wel waar is, is dat die Instituut alle valse gesag wat in die Kerk van Christus tot gelding wil kom, bv. dié van ’n geheime politieke organisasie soos die Broederbond, met weersin verwerp.** Of dit nog moontlik is dat die kerk in ons land hom van hierdie politieke wurggreep kan bevry langs die weg van besluite wat hy op sy amptelike vergaderings neem, is ’n kwellende vraag — veral as ’n mens terugdink aan die Sinodes van die Ned. Geref. Kerk sedert Cottesloe (1960) en in besonder aan die Sinode van die Ned. Geref. Kerk van Suid-Transvaal in 1963, toe die Broederbond feitlik salig gesprek en die blad PRO VERITATE afgekeur is.

(vii) As ds. van Loggerenberg beswaar maak teen ’n „**verstrengeling van politiek en godsdiens**”, en dit as ’n beskuldiging teen die Instituut inbring, vra ’n mens jou met verbasing af: Wil hy dan ’n politiek hê sonder godsdiens? Klaarblyklik nie, want hy praat self van „die gehate Suid-Afrika met sy Bybelse beleid van differensiasie en eiesoortigheid” wat „met behulp van ons Christelike offervaardigheid” nasionale eenhede bou. Die verskil tussen die verstrengeling van politiek en godsdiens soos ds. van Loggerenberg dit wil hê, enersyds, en soos die Christelike Instituut dit sien, andersyds, is dit, nl. dat die gedagterigting wat ds. van Loggerenberg voorstaan, op die Bybel wil beslag lê ten dienste van ’n apartheids-ideologie, terwyl die Instituut niks meer bepleit nie as dat die Skrif as die **hoogste kritiese instansie vry sal bly ten opsigte van alle menslike ideologieë en elke politieke beleid**, sodat Gods Woord die rigskoer mag bly vir die koers van die politiek. Die Instituut sal ’n beleid van selfstandige ontwikkeling in ’n veel-rassige land soos Suid-Afrika wel nie as onbybels bestry nie en het dit ook nog nooit gedoen nie. Maar dat hierdie beleid uit die Bybel afgelees word, sodat dit deurgevoer kan word sonder dat dit voortdurend weer op gespanne voet verkeer met die sentrale boodskap van die Skrif, nl. die Koninkryk van God, dit sal die Instituut steeds met die grootste beslistheid ontken. ’n Beleid van afsonderlike ontwikkeling kan alleen vir Christene aanneemlik wees as dit uitgevoer word onder die kritiek van Gods Woord wat waaragtig nie ’n boodskap van „ewig-

durende apartheid” bevat nie, maar van ’n Koninkryk waarin God „alle dinge wat in die hemele sowel as op die aarde is, onder een hoof in Christus . . . verenig.” (Ef. 1:10).

(viii) Voordat ds. van Loggerenberg geantwoord kan word op die verwyte van „**integrasië-godsdiens**” wat hy teen die Instituut slinger, sal ons eers moet weet wat hy daarmee bedoel. Bedoel hy miskien ’n Christelike gemeenskapsbeoefening oor die grense van taal en ras en kultuur en sosiale stand heen? **Sou ds. van Loggerenberg ’n uitspraak soos die volgende kan onderskryf?** „Die wese van die kerk vind ons in die gemeenskap van persone, met mekaar in Christus deur die geloof teenoor die res van die mensdom verbind deur die Heilige Gees as lede van dieselfde mistieke geestelike liggaam. Hier het ons te doen met ’n eenheid, veel sterker en meer wesenlik, veel intenser en meer dinamies as algemene vriendskap, welwillendheid of samewerking. Dit is ’n organiese eenheid van almal wat deur die Heilige Gees in Christus ingelyf is. Dit is ’n nuwe skepping, ’n organiese gemeenskap, genoem die liggaam van Christus (1 Kor. 12). Op hierdie gemeenskap (*koinonia*) laat val die Skrif besondere klem.” En: „Die Kerk van Christus wat Hy uit alle volke vergader, vorm ’n eenheid, en die eenheid van sy mistieke liggaam, die gemeenskap van die heiliges (*koinonia*) moet steeds die meeste nadruk ontvang.” Kan ds. van Loggerenberg dit onderskryf?

**Die Christelike Instituut wil hom vir niks anders en niks meer beywer as die Christelike koinonia nie.** En sonder ’n „saam-wees” van Christene in ons land, nie op ’n humanistiese grondslag nie maar op grondslag van Gods genade in Christus, is hierdie *koinonia* ondenkbaar. Dit sluit ook die Nagmaalsgemeenskap in! Hierdie „saam-wees” beoog niks minder as om die geloof te betuig dat verskille wat betref volk of ras of taal of stand nie genoeg is om ons „ewigdurend” van mekaar geskeie te hou nie. Die Christelike Instituut wil nie die dwase en die onmoontlike probeer forseer om alle gelowiges uit verskillende taalgroepe vandaan in een kerkgebou saam te dwing en sodoende verskille wat daar bestaan wat verskillende gemeentes vir verskillende taalgroepe wenslik en noodsaaklik maak, negeer nie. Maar dat die Christelike gemeenskapsbeoefening ophou om Christelik te wees sodra dit eksklusief raak volgens die maatstaf van ras of kleur, en dat dit tewens (veral in Suid-Afrika) noodsaaklik is dat Christene uit verskillende rasse mekaar rondom die Woord van God sal ontmoet om mekaar in Christus te vind, is ’n oortuiging waarvoor die Christelike Instituut nie sal ophou om te stry nie. En dit wil hy doen in gemeenskap met die Ned. Geref. Kerk! As die Instituut op grond daarvan met ’n skelwoord „integrasië-godsdiens” gediskwalifiseer word, moet daar tog bedink word dat hy hom daarmee nog steeds bevind in die geselskap van niemand minder as die Ned. Geref. Kerk self, altans vóór Cottesloe nie. **Vir lesers wat miskien nie weet nie, die uitsprake hierbo wat ons aan ds. van Loggerenberg voorgehou het, is aanvaarde uitsprake van die Ned. Geref. Kerk in verband met rasse-verhoudinge.** Dit dateer uit 1957, dus . . . voor Cottesloe. In daardie uitsprake herken ons ’n gesag waaronder ons wil buig.