21.10 BESWAARSKRIF (ARTT 31, 33 EN 46) VAN GK NOORDRAND, KLERKSDORP EN WAPADRANT TEEN BESLUITE VAN DIE AFGEVAARDIGDES VAN DIE GKSA IN DIE ALGEMENE SINODE IN 2009 EN IN DIE BUITENGEWONE ALGEMENE SINODE IN 2016

21.10 PETITION OF PROTEST (ARTS 31, 33 AND 46) OF GK NOORDRAND, KLERKSDORP AND WAPADRANT AGAINST RESOLUTIONS BY THE DELEGATES OF THE GKSA IN THE GENERAL SYNOD IN 2009 AND THE EXTRAORDINARY GENERAL SYNOD IN 2016

Aan: Die Algemene Sinode van die GKSA in Januarie 2018 te Potchefstroom. Van: Die Kerkrade van die GK Noordrand, Klerksdorp en Wapadrant. Datum: 26 November 2017.	To: The General Synod of the GKSA in January 2018 at Potchefstroom. From: The Church Councils of the GK Noordrand, Klerksdorp and Wapadrant. Date: November 26, 2017.
Inhoud – Indiening : Beswaarskrif Die volgende inligting word ter toeligting deurgegee rakende die indiening van die Beswaarskrif.	**Contents – Submission : Point of protest** The following information are provided for clarification regarding the submission of the Point of protest.
1. Die Beswaarskrif (KO, art 46) is langs die kerklike weg (KO, artt 30 en 33; Acta 2012:23, 5.2.1) deur die Kerkrade van die GK Noordrand, Klerksdorp en Wapadrant ingedien.	1. The Petition of protest (CO, art 46) is being submitted by the Church Councils of the GK Noordrand, Klerksdorp and Wapadrant in accordance to the ecclesiastical way (CO, art 30 and 33; Acta 2012:23, 5.2.1).
2. Die GK Noordrand het die Beswaarskrif ingedien by Klassis Wesrand van 9 September 2017 en by Streeksinode Randvaal van 21 November 2017.	2. The GK Noordrand submitted the Petition to Classis Wesrand of 9 September 2017 and the Regional Synod Randvaal of 21 November 2017.
3. Die GK Klerksdorp het die Beswaarskrif ingedien by Klassis Noordwes van 19 September 2017 en by Streeksinode Noordwes van 21 November 2017.	3. The GK Klerksdorp submitted the Petition to Classis Noordwes of 19 September 2017 and the Regional Synod Noordwes of 21 November 2017.
4. Die GK Wapadrant het die Beswaarskrif ingedien by Klassis Oostelike Pretoria van 16 Oktober 2017 en Streeksinode Pretoria van van 21 November 2017.	4. The GK Wapadrant submitted the Petition to Classis Oostelike Pretoria of 16 October 2017 and to Regional Synod Pretoria of 21 November 2017.
5. Besluite deur Streeksinodes Noordwes (Notule Streeksinode Noordwes, 15.2, p169) en Pretoria het aan die Kerkrade toestemming gegee om die Beswaarskrif by die Algemene Sinode 2018 in te dien.	5. Resolutions by Regional Synods Noordwes (Minutes 15.2, p169) and Pretoria has given permission to the churches to submit the Petition of protest to the General Synod in 2018.
6. Streeksinode Randvaal het geen besluit oor die Beswaarskrif geneem nie.	6. Regional Synod Randvaal has not taken a decision on the Petition of protest.
7. Die Beswaarskrif word deur die Kerkrade ingedien vir behandeling, deur die afgevaardigdes van die GKSA wat (DV) in die Algemene Sinode in Januarie 2018 in Potchefstroom vergader, in die lig van KO, artt 30, 33 en 46 en die besluit deur die afgevaardigdes van die GKSA in die Algemene Sinode in 2012: *"Sou 'n Beswaarskrif langs die weg van*	7. The Petition of protest is submitted by the Church Councils for treatment by the delegates of the GKSA, meeting (DV) in the General Synod in Potchefstroom in January 2018, in the light of CO, arts 30, 33 and 46 and the decision by the delegates of the GKSA in the General Synod in 2012: *"If a Petition of protest does not receive*

KO, art 33 nie die nodige ondersteuning ontvang nie, en die beswaarde/s nie die advies van die betrokke mindere vergadering kan aanvaar nie, kan die beswaarde/s steeds die Beswaarskrif by die vergadering wat die besluit geneem het vir oorweging indien" (Acta 2012:23, 5.2.2).	*the necessary support along the way of CO, art 33 , and the petitioners can not accept the advice of the minor assembly, the petitioners may still submit the petition to be dealt with by the assembly that took the decision"* (Acta 2012:23, 5.2.2 – free translation from Afrikaans).
Groete in Christus	Greetings in Christ
Kerkrade van die GK Noordrand, Klerksdorp en Wapadrant.	Church Councils of the GK Noordrand, Klerksdorp and Wapadrant.

A. INLEIDING: BESWAARSKRIF	A. INTRODUCTION: PETITION OF PROTEST
1. Algemeen	**1. General**
1.1 Die Kerkrade van die Gereformeerde Kerke Noordrand, Klerksdorp en Wapadrant het afsonderlik en gesamentlik na deeglike besinning en oorweging besluit om die Beswaarskrif in te dien.	1.1 The Church Councils of the Reformed Churches Noordrand, Klerksdorp and Wapadrant decided separately and jointly, after careful deliberation, to submit the Petition of protest.
1.2 Die Beswaarskrif word ingedien teen besluite deur afgevaardigdes van die Gereformeerde Kerke in Suid-Afrika (GKSA) in die Algemene Sinode in 2009 en in die Buitengewone Algemene Sinode in 2016.	1.2 The Petition is submitted in protest against decisions by delegates of the Reformed Churches in South Africa (GKSA) during the General Synod in 2009 and during the Extraordinary General Synod in 2016.
1.3 Die Beswaarskrif word ingedien omdat die bediening van die gesag van Christus in die regering van die Gereformeerde Kerke bedreig word deur kerklike besluite wat valse gesag bedien en met valse gesag op die kerke afgedwing word.	1.3 The Petition of protest is submitted because the administering of the authority of Christ in the government of the Reformed Churches is being threatened by ecclesiastical decisions administering false authority and which are forced upon the churches by false authority.
2. Indiening : Beswaarskrif	**2. Submitting : Petition of protest**
2.1 Die Beswaarskrif word ingedien langs die kerklike weg (KO, artt 30 en 33) in die lig van Sinodebesluite in die verband (Acta 2012:23, 5.2).	2.1 The Petition of protest is submitted along the ecclesiastical route (CO, arts 30 and 33) according to Synodical decisions in this regard (Acts 2012:23, 5.2).
2.1.1 Die Beswaarskrif word ingedien in die lig van KO, artt 30 en 46 en in die lig van die besluit deur die afgevaardigdes van die wat in die Algemene Sinode in 2012 vergader het.	2.1.1 The Petition is submitted in accordance with CO, arts 30 and 46 and the resolution taken by the delegates of the GKSA assembled in the General Synod in 2012.
2.1.2 In die lig van die KO, art 30 is die saak wat die Beswaarskrif ter tafel bring ‘n saak wat meer kerke raak en kan daarom nie deur ‘n Klassis of Streeksinode afgehandel word nie.	2.1.2 In light of CO, art 30 the matter tabled by this Petition is a matter that concerns more churches and therefore it can not be finalized by a Classis or Regional Synod.
2.1.3 Die besluit deur Sinode 2012, *“Sou ‘n Beswaarskrif langs die weg van KO, art 33 nie die nodige ondersteuning ontvang nie, en die beswaarde/s nie die advies van die betrokke mindere vergadering kan aanvaar nie, kan die beswaarde/s steeds die Beswaarskrif by die vergadering wat die besluit geneem het vir oorweging indien”* (Acta 2012:23, 2.2.2) laat toe dat die Beswaarskrif in die lig van KO, art 46 by die Algemene Sinode 2018 ingedien kan word.	2.1.3 The resolution by Synod 2012, *“Sou ‘n Beswaarskrif langs die weg van KO, art 33 nie die nodige ondersteuning ontvang nie, en die beswaarde/s nie die advies van die betrokke mindere vergadering kan aanvaar nie, kan die beswaarde/s steeds die Beswaarskrif by die vergadering wat die besluit geneem het vir oorweging indien”* (Acta 2012:23, 2.2.2) allows the submission of the Petition to the General Synod 2018.

3. Ontvanklikheid : Beswaarskrif (KO, art 46)	**3. Acceptability : Petition of protest (CO, art 46)**
3.1 Verskeie Beswaarskrifte is deur kerke teen die 2009-besluit (Acta 2009:667, 4) ingedien. Dit bevestig dat kerke die besluit nie as gesagvol aanvaar nie.	3.1 A number of Petitions of protest were submitted by churches against the 2009 resolution (Acta 2009:667, 4), confirming that churches do not accept the decision as authoritative.
3.2 Oor die Beswaarskrifte is besluite geneem deur die afgevaardigdes van die GKSA in die Buitengewone Algemene Sinode in 2016 (Acta 2016:50-61, 21.3; 62-70, 21.4; 71-83, 21.5; 96-100, 21.8; 101-127, 21.2; 128-133, 21.3). Met die besluite is die 2009-besluit verdedig en besware daarteen afgewys.	3.2 The delegates of the GKSA, assembled in the Extraordinary General Synod in 2016, made several resolutions concerning the said Petitions (Acta 2016:50-61, 21.3; 62-70, 21.4;71-83, 21.5; 96-100, 21.8; 101-127, 21.2; 128-133, 21.3). The said resolutions were in favour of the 2009 decision and rejected the Petitions of protest.
3.3 Die Kerkrade het kennis geneem van Beswaarskrifte en die besluite daaroor deur die afgevaardigdes van die Gereformeerde Kerke in die Buitengewone Algemene Sinode 2016.	3.3 Church Councils took note of the Petitions and the resolutions by delegates of the Reformed Churches in the Extraordinary General Synod in 2016.
3.4 Nie een van die Beswaarskrifte maak beswaar – soos hierdie Beswaarskrif doen – dat die 2009-besluit valse gesag bedien en met valse gesag op die kerke afgedwing word nie. Acta 2016 toon dat die begrip *'vals'* deur die 'Kommissie Kerkregtelik' (Acta 2016:67, 78, 98, 130 - 3.3; 69, 4.2.1.1), en deur 'n Beswaarskrif teen die besluit dat vroue in die lig van die Skrif in die besondere diens van diakens mag dien (Acta 2016:86, 2.1.1.5.3), gebruik is. Nie in een van die twee gevalle gaan dit oor die valse gesag wat die 2009-besluit bedien nie. 'n Nuwe beswaar – die van valse gesag – teen die 2009-besluit is ontvanklik in die lig van KO, artt 30, 31, 33 en 46.	3.4 None of the said Petitions protested against the 2009 resolution on the basis that it administers false authority or that it is forced on the churches with false authority – as this Petition does. Acta 2016 shows that the concept of "false" was employed by the 'Commission Church polity (Acta 2016:67, 78, 98, 130, 3.3; 69, 4.2.1.1), as well as in a Petition of protest against the decision that in accordance with Scripture, women may serve in the particular service of deacon (Acta 2016:86, 2.1.1.5.3). In neither of the two cases is the false authority administered by the 2009 resolution raised. Consequently this new protest – that of false authority – against the 2009-decision, is acceptable in the light of CO, arts 30, 31, 33 and 46.
3.5 Die besware teen die 2016-besluite is nuwe sake en is ontvanklik in die lig van KO, artt 30, 31, 33 en 46.	3.5 The objections against the 2016-resolutions are new matters and are acceptable in light of CO, arts 30, 31, 33 and 46.
3.6 Die besluite waarteen beswaar gemaak word, word aangehaal in B.1.	3.6 The resolutions objected against, are quoted in B 1.
3.7 Duidelike motivering vir die beswaar word in beswaargronde in C.1-4 gegee.	3.7 Clear justifications for the protest are set out in the grounds of objection in C. 1-4.
3.8 In die lig van bogenoemde oordeel die Kerkrade dat hierdie Beswaarskrif teen die 2009-besluit en die 2016-besluite ontvanklik is.	3.8 In the light of the foregoing, the Church Councils judge that this Petition of protest against the 2009-decision and the 2016-resolutions is acceptable.

4. Vertrekpunte : Beswaarskrif	**4. Basis : Petition of protest**
4.1 *Skrifgetroue : Kerkregering* Die het die Presbiterial wyse van kerkregering aanvaar, omdat dit die mees Skrifgetroue wyse van kerkregering is. Enkele grondbeginsels van die Presbiterial kerkregering (presbiters/ouderlinge) en van hierdie Beswaarskrif is die volgende:	4.1 *Scriptural : Church government* Because Presbyterian Church governance conforms more closely to Scriptural precepts of church governance it has been adopted by the GKSA. Some principles of Presbyterian Church governance (presbyters /elders) and of this Petition are the following:
4.1.1 Solo Christo – Christus is die enigste Hoof en Koning van sy kerk. Hy alleen regeer sy kerk. Christus dra nie sy gesag in die regering van sy kerk oor aan ampsdraers of aan kerklike vergaderings nie. Christus gebruik ouderlinge om sy gesag te bedien in die regering van sy kerk.	4.1.1 Solo Christo – Christ is the only Head and King of his church. Christ alone governs his church. Christ does not transfer his governing powers to office bearers or to ecclesiastical assemblies. Christ calls elders to administer his authority in the government of his church.
4.1.2 Sola Scriptura – Christus alleen regeer sy kerk deur sy Woord en Gees. Christus laat sy gesag in die regering van sy kerk bedien deur presbiters wat besluite oor kerklike sake onder leiding van die Heilige Gees in gehoorsaamheid aan sy Woord neem.	4.1.2 Sola Scriptura – Christ alone governs his church through his Word and his Spirit. Christ administers his authority in the governance of his church through presbyters making decisions on ecclesiastical matters under the guidance of the Holy Spirit and in obedience to his Word.
4.2 *Gesag : Kerklike besluite*	4.2 *Authority : Ecclesiastical Resolutions*
4.2.1 <u>Ware gesag : Kerklike besluite</u>	4.2.1 <u>True authority : Church resolutions</u>
4.2.1.1 Waarheid en die bediening van ware gesag in kerklike besluite is onlosmaaklik verbind aan Christus en sy Woord.	4.2.1.1 Truth and the administering of true authority in ecclesiastical decisions are inseparable from Christ and his Word.
4.2.1.2 Die kenmerke van die ware kerk is dat almal hulle ooreenkomstig die suiwere Woord van God gedra, alles wat daarmee in stryd is verwerp en Jesus Christus as die enigste Hoof erken (NGB, art 29).	4.2.1.2 The marks of the true church are that it governs itself according to the pure Word of God, rejecting all things contrary to it and holding Jesus Christ as the only Head (BC, art 29).
4.2.1.3 Kerklike besluite wat Skrifgegrond en gemotiveer is, bedien ware gesag – die gesag van Christus.	4.2.1.3 Ecclesiastical decisions that are based on and justified by Scripture, administer true authority – the authority of Christ.
4.2.1.4 Kerklike besluite wat die gesag van Christus bedien omdat hulle Skrifgegrond is, is vas en bindend en sal gewillig en blymoedig deur sy kerk gehoorsaam word.	4.2.1.4 Ecclesiastical decisions that administer Christ's authority, because they are based on Scripture, are fixed and binding and will be willingly and joyfully obeyed by his church.
4.2.2 <u>Valse gesag : Kerklike besluite</u>	4.2.2 <u>False authority : Ecclesiastical resolutions</u>

4.2.2.1 Die valse kerk is ‘n werklikheid (NGB, art 29) en daarmee saam, die gevaar van valse gesag in kerklike besluite.	4.2.2.1 The false church is a reality (BC, art 29) and so too the danger of false authority in church decisions.
4.2.2.2 Kerklike besluite wat NIE in die Skrif geanker en gemotiveer is NIE, bedien nie die gesag van Christus nie maar valse gesag.	4.2.2.2 Ecclesiastical decisions which are not based on and justified by Scripture, administer false authority and not the authority of Christ.
4.2.2.3 Die valse kerk skryf aan homself en sy besluite meer mag en gesag toe as aan die Woord van God en wil homself nie aan Christus onderwerp nie (NGB, art 29).	4.2.2.3 The false church assigns more authority to itself and its ordinances than to the Word of God; and it does not want to subject itself to Christ (BC, art 29).
4.2.2.4 Kerklike besluite sonder grondige motivering uit die Skrif, Belydenis of Kerkorde kom neer om menslike versinsels en wette (NGB, art 32) wat mense invoer om God te dien en gewetens te bind.	4.2.2.4 Ecclesiastical resolutions without sound foundation in the Word of God, in the Confessions or the Church Order, boil down to human innovations and laws which men introduce into the worship of God to bind and force our consciences (BC, art32).
4.2.2.5 Christus (solo Christo) en die Skrif (sola Scriptura) alleen bepaal die gesag van kerklike besluite (Spoelstra 1989:143, 3).	4.2.2.5 Christ alone (solo Christo) and Scripture alone (sola Scriptura) determine the authority of ecclesiastical resolutions (Spoelstra 1989:143, 3).
B. BESWAAR : BESWAARSKRIF	**B. OBJECTION: PETITION OF PROTEST**
1. Besluite : Beswaar Beswaar word gemaak teen die volgende besluite deur afgevaardigdes van die GKSA in die Algemene Sinode in 2009 en in die Buitengewone Algemene Sinode in 2016.	**1. Decisions : Protest** Objection is made against the decisions taken by delegates of the GKSA assembled in the General Synod in 2009 and in the Extraordinary General Synod in 2016.
1.1 *Besluit : 2009* Beswaar word gemaak teen die besluit deur afgevaardigdes van die GKSA in die Algemene Sinode in 2009 (Acta 2009:667, 4): ***4. Aanbevelings*** *4.1 Die Sinode spreek sy opregte dank uit teenoor die Kommissie vir die deeglike werk wat gedoen is om ‘n duidelike Rapport vir die Sinode voor te berei.* *4.2 Die Sinode stem aan die hand van die volgende veranderde bewoording van pt 10.15 en 12.10.2 van die Rapport:*	1.1 *Decision : 2009* Objection is made against the decision taken by delegates of the GKSA in the General Synod in 2009 (Acta 2009:667, 4): *(Free translation from Afrikaans)* ***“4. Recommendations*** *4.1 The Synod expresses its sincere gratitude to the Commission for its thorough and clear report.* *4.2 The Synod votes upon the amended wording of 10.15 and 12.10.2 in the Report:*

Die Sinode het in die lig van die behandeling van die Rapport tot die oortuiging gekom	*The Synod came, after reviewing the Report to the conviction*
• *dat vroue in die besondere dienste van predikante en ouderling mag dien* OF • *dat vroue nie in die besondere dienste van predikante en ouderling mag dien nie.*	• *that women may serve in the special offices of minister and elder.* OR • *that women may not serve in the special offices of minister and elder.*
4.3 Die Sinode wys, ongeag die besluit wat geneem word, 'n ad hoc-kommissie aan om die Sinode te adviseer oor pt 11 van Kommissie-rapport en ander sake wat uit die besluit sou voortvloei. Na ons oordeel moet die vinnige kommunikasie met die gemeentes deur 'n skrywe oor die besluit met die oog op bekendmaking daarvan eerskomende Sondag 5 Julie beskikbaar wees. ***Besluit: Pte 4.1 tot 4.3 word goed-gekeur.*** ***Besluit:*** *Die vergadering besluit volg-ens die goedgekeurde aanbeveling, pt 4.2, dat vroue nie in die besondere dienste van predikante en ouderlinge mag dien nie.*	*4.3 The Synod appoints, regardless of the decision reached, an ad hoc Commission to advise the Synod on pt 11 of the Commission's report and other matters that would result from the decision. It is recommended that a brief letter be drawn up by Sunday, 5 July advising the congregations of the impending decision.* ***Decision: Pt 4.1 to 4.3 approved*** ***Decision:*** *The meeting decides, in accordance with the approved recommendation under pt 4.2, that women may not serve in the special offices of minister and elder.*
Opmerkings : 2009-besluit 1.1.1 Die afgevaardigdes van die GKSA in die Algemene Sinode in 2009 neem 2 (twee) besluite in die lig van die Rapport van 'n Advieskommissie. 1.1.2 Die eerste besluit keur die aanbe-velings van die Advieskommissie in 4.1 tot 4.3 goed. Hierdeur word die aanbeveling (Acta 2009:667, 4.2) aanvaar dat daar gekies word tussen 2 (twee) opsies – JA of NEE dat vroue in die besondere dienste van predikante en ouderlinge mag dien. 1.1.3 Met die tweede besluit kies die afgevaardigdes van die GKSA vir die NEE-opsie – dat vroue nie in die besondere dienste van predikante en ouderlinge mag dien nie.	**Comments : 2009 Decision** 1.1.1 The delegates of the GKSA in the General Synod in 2009 took 2 (two) decisions in the light of the Report by an Advisory Commission. 1.1.2 The first decision approves the recommendations of the Advisory Commission in 4.1 to 4.3. In so doing, the recommendation (Acta 2009:667, 4.2) is accepted to choose between 2 (two) options – YES or NO for women to serve in the particular offices of ministers and elders. 1.1.3 By the second decision, the delegates of the GKSA choose the NO-option – that women may not serve in the particular offices of ministers and elders.
1.2 *Besluite : 2016* Beswaar word gemaak teen die volgende besluite deur afgevaardigdes	1.2 *Decisions : 2016* Objection is made against the following decisions by delegates of the

van die Gereformeerde Kerke in die Buitengewone Algemene Sinode in 2016:	Reformed Churches assembled in the Extraordinary General Synod in 2016:
1.2.1 Besluit oor die Beswaarskrif van die GK Bloemfontein-Suid (Acta 2016:59, 2.11) 2.11 Aanbeveling Beswaargrond 3 slaag nie. Besluit: Goedgekeur.	1.2.1 Decision concerning the Petition of protest submitted by the GK Bloemfontein-Suid (Acta 2016:59, 2.11) 2.11 Recommendation Ground of objection 3 does not succeed Decision: Approve.
1.2.2 Besluite oor die Beswaarskrif van die GK Klerksdorp (Acta 2016:69, 4.2.2.1; 70, 4.3.2.1, 4.4.2.1 en 4.6) 4.2.2.1 Beswaargrond 1 slaag nie Besluit: Goedgekeur. 4.3.2.1 Beswaargrond 2 slaag nie Besluit: Goedgekeur. 4.2.2.1 Beswaargrond 3 slaag nie Besluit: Goedgekeur.	1.2.2 Decisions concerning the Petition of protest submitted by the GK Klerksdorp (Acta 2016:69, 4.2.2.1; 70, 4.3.2.1, 4.4.2.1 and 4.6) 4.2.2.1 Ground for objection 1 does not succeed Decision: Approved**.** 4.3.2.1 Ground for objection 2 does not succeed Decision: Approved**.** 4.4.2.1 Ground of objection 3 does not succeed. Decision: Approved.
1.2.3 Besluite oor die Beswaarskrif van die GK Krugersdorp (Acta 2016:81, 4.1.2 en 4.2.2) 4.1.2 Aanbeveling 4.1.2.1 Beswaargrond 1 slaag nie Besluit: Goedgekeur 4.2.2 Aanbeveling 4.2.2.1 Wat hierdie motiveringspunt betref slaag beswaargrond 4 nie Besluit: Goedgekeur	1.2.3 Decision concerning the Petition of protest submitted by the GK Krugersdorp (Acta 2016:81, 4.1.2 and 4.2.2) 4.1.2 Recommendation 4.1.2.1 Ground for objection 1 does not succeed Decision: Approved 4.2.2 Recommendation 4.2.2.1 As far as this motivation is concerned Ground for objection 4 does not succeed. Decision: Approved.
1.2.4 Opmerkings : 2016-besluite Die 2016-besluite verdedig die 2009-besluit. Met die besluite word besware teen die 2009-besluit afgewys.	1.2.4 Comments: 2016-decisions The 2016-decisions defend the 2009-decision. The 2016-resolutions reject protests against the 2009-decision.
2. Beswaar : Besluite Teen die besluite hierbo in B.1. word beswaar gemaak omdat:	**2. Protest : Decisions** Objection is taken against the decisions set out above in B.1. for the following reasons:
2.1 die besluite valse gesag bedien; 2.2 die besluite met valse gesag op die kerke afgedwing word; 2.3 valse gesag in kerklike besluitneming die bediening van die gesag van Christus verdring en die weg open vir menslike-heerskappyvoering in die	2.1 the decisions administer false authority; 2.2 the decisions are forced upon the churches with false authority; 2.3 the authority of Christ is ousted by false authority in ecclesiastical decisions, which opens the way for human dominion in the church; and

kerk;	
2.4 die kerke, kerklike besluite wat valse gesag bedien, nie as vas en bindend kan en mag aanvaar nie.	2.4 the churches should not and may not hold ecclesiastical decisions administering false authority, as fixed and binding.
Die beswaar word gemotiveer deur die onderstaande beswaargronde.	This objection is justified by the grounds of objection set out below.
C. MOTIVERING : BESWAAR	**C. JUSTIFICATION: OBJECTION**
1. Beswaargrond 1 – Valse gesag: Skrifgesag ontbreek	**1. Ground of objection 1 – False authority : Absence of Scriptural authority**
Die besluit deur die afgevaardigdes van die GKSA in die Algemene Sinode in 2009 (Acta 2009:667, 4) bedien valse gesag omdat Skrifgesag vir die besluit ontbreek.	The decision by the delegates of the GKSA in the General Synod in 2009 (Acta 2009:667, 4) administers false authority because of the absence of Scriptural authority for the decision.
1.1 *Motivering 1 : Beswaargrond 1 – Geen Skrifmotivering : 2009-besluit*	1.1 *Justification 1 : Ground of objection 1 – No scriptural justification : 2009-decision*
1.1.1 Skrifmotivering ontbreek	1.1.1 Absence : Scriptural justification
1.1.1.1 Skrifmotivering vir die 2009-besluit ontbreek.	1.1.1.1 Scriptural justification for the 2009-decision is absent.
1.1.1.2 Geen motivering is gegee vir die aanbeveling deur die Advieskommissie vir ‘n keuse tussen die JA- of NEE-opsie nie (Acta 2009:667, 4.2).	1.1.1.2 No justification is supplied for the recommendation by the Advisory Commission for the choice to be made between the YES- or NO-options (Acta 2009: 667, 4.2).
1.1.1.3 Geen motivering is gegee vir die besluit wat die aanbeveling vir ‘n keuse tussen die JA- en NEE-opsie, goedgekeur het nie. *Besluit: Pte 4.1 tot 4.3 word goedgekeur* (Acta 2009:667, 4).	1.1.1.3 No justification is supplied for the decision approving the recommendation for the choice between the YES- and NO-options. *Decision: Items 4.1 to 4.3 are Approved* (Acta 2009:667, 4).
1.1.1.4 Geen motivering en geen SKRIF-motivering is vir die 2009-besluit, waarmee die NEE-opsie gekies is, gegee nie. *Besluit: Die vergadering besluit volgens die goedgekeurde aanbeveling, pt 4.2, dat vroue nie in die besondere dienste van predikante en ouderlinge mag dien nie (Acta 2009:667, 4).*	1.1.1.4 No justification at all and specifically no Scriptural justify-cation are supplied for the decision choosing the NO-option. *Decision: The meeting decides, in accordance with the Approved recommendation under pt. 4.2, that women may not serve in the special offices of ministers and elders. (Acta 2009:667, 4).*
1.1.2 Neem kennis : Skrifgetuienis	1.1.2 Taking note : Scriptural evidence
1.1.2.1 In die Rapport in 2009 word verskillende teenoorgestelde geloofwaardige en houdbare eksegese van verskillende Skrifgedeeltes ter tafel gebring (Acta 2009:611-664, 10). Hiervan word bloot KENNIS GENEEM deur die afgevaardigdes	1.1.2.1 The Report of 2009 tabled different reliable and trustworthy exegeses of different texts from Scripture (Acta 2009:611-664,10).The delegates of the GKSA in the 2009 Synod merely NOTED the Scriptural evidence tabled in these exe-

	van die GKSA in die Algemene Sinode in 2009 (Acta 2009:665, 12.10.1).		geses (Acta 2009:665, 12.10.1).
1.1.2.2	KENNIS NEEM beteken dat die afgevaardigdes van die GKSA in die Algemene Sinode in 2009, die voorgestelde standpunte in die Rapport – en daarmee die Skrifgetuienis ter tafel – NIE vir hulle rekening neem NIE. Die feit word bevestig deur die aanbevelings van die Kerkregtelike Kommissie aan die afgevaardigdes van die GKSA in die Buitengewone Algemene Sinode in 2016: "*'n Vergadering het, byvoorbeeld, die prerogatief om bloot kennis te neem van 'n voorstel wat hy nie vir sy eie rekening wil neem nie"* Die feit word 4 (vier) keer herhaal (Acta 2016:67; 79; 98; 131, 3.7).	1.1.2.2	NOTED means that the delegates of the GKSA in the General Synod in 2009, DO NOT ADOPT the proposed points of view in the Report and consequently the Scriptural evidence tabled, FOR THEIR OWN ACCOUNT. This fact is confirmed by recommendations from the 'Commission Church polity' to the delegates of the GKSA assembled in the Extraordinary General Synod in 2016: *"A meeting, for instance, has the prerogative to simply take note of a proposal that it does not want to take for its account".* This fact is repeated 4 (four) times (Acta 2016:67; 79; 98; 131, 3.7).
1.1.2.3	Die 2009-besluit (KENNIS GENEEM) beteken nie dat al die Skrifgetuienis wat die NEE-opsie ondersteun aanvaar en dat al die Skrifgetuienis wat die JA-opsie ondersteun verwerp is nie. Oor al die Skrifgetuienis vir die JA- en NEE-opsies is reeds besluit: KENNIS GENEEM (Acta 2009:665, 12.10.1). Die betrokke besluit 'kennis geneem', kan soos onderling ooreengekom, alleen verander word in die lig van KO, artt 31 en 46.	1.1.2.3	The 2009-decision (NOTED) does not mean that all the Scriptural evidence in support of the NO-option was accepted or that all the Scriptural evidence in support of the YES-option was rejected. As far as the Scriptural evidence covering both the YES- and NO-options, a decision had been made. That decision was: NOTED (Acta 2009:665, 12.10.1). As mutually agreed, the relevant decision may only be amended in accordance with CO, arts 31 and 46.
1.1.2.4	<u>Omdat daar slegs kennis geneem is van die verskillende teenoorgestelde geloofwaardige en houdbare eksegese van verskillende Skrifgedeeltes in die Rapport, gee dit nie en kan dit nie Skrifmotivering vir die 2009-besluit gee nie.</u> Daarom is die 'Kommissie Kerkregtelik' se bevindings en aanbevelings by die Buitengewone Algemene Sinode 2016 in die verband nie waar nie.	1.1.2.4	<u>Because the different reliable and trustworthy exegeses of different parts of Scripture in the Report were merely noted, they do not and cannot serve as Scriptural justification for the 2009-decision</u>. Consequently the conclusions and recommendations by the 'Commission Church polity' to the Extraordinary General Synod 2016 in this regard, are not true and boil down to information that is not true.
1.1.2.5	Die Kommissie sê dat die 2009-besluit juis op grond van die Skrifgegewens in die Rapport geneem is (Acta 2016:67, 78, 98, 130, 3.3). Dit is nie waar nie. Die Kommissie bevestig dit self. Die	1.1.2.5	The said Commission states that the 2009-decision was based on the Scriptural evidence in the Report (Acta 2016:67, 78, 98, 130, 3.3). This is not true. The Commission itself confirms this falsehood. The

Kommissie wys dat 'n besluit om kennis te neem beteken dat 'n kerklike vergadering die standpunte nie vir eie rekening neem nie (Acta 2016:67; 79; 98; 131, 3.7). Daar is net kennis geneem van die Skrifgegewens in die Rapport (Acta 2009:665, 12.10.1). Daarom kan die Skrifgegewens in die Rapport nie – soos die 'Kommissie Kerkregtelik' sê – as Skrifmotivering vir die 2009-besluit dien nie.	Commission points out that a decision to take note means that an ecclesiastical assembly does not adopt the relevant proposals for its own account (Acta 2016:67; 79; 98; 131, 3.7). The Scriptural evidence tabled by the Report was merely noted (Acta 2009:665; 12.10.1). Consequently the Scriptural evidence tabled in the Report cannot be presented as Scriptural justification for the 2009 decision, as the 'Commission Church polity' has said.
1.1.3 <u>Gehoorsaamheid aan die Skrif : Behandeling van die Rapport</u>	1.1.3 <u>Obedience to Scripture : Reviewing the Report</u>
1.1.3.1 Die Kommissierapport het aanbeveel dat die afgevaardigdes van die GKSA in die Algemene Sinode 2009 'in gehoorsaamheid aan die Skrif' (Acta 2009:664, 10.15), tussen die JA- en NEE-opsies kies. Die Advieskommissie wysig die aanbeveling en gee geen motivering vir die wysiging nie. Die gewysigde aanbeveling vra, dat die besluit vir die JA- of NEE-opsies NIE 'in gehoorsaamheid aan die SKRIF' NIE, maar 'in die lig van die behandeling van die Rapport' geneem word. So word die besluit aan die kerke bekend gemaak – 'in die lig van die behandeling van die Rapport' het die Sinode tot die oortuiging gekom dat vroue nie in die besondere dienste van predikant en ouderling mag dien nie (Acta 2009:669, 2).	1.1.3.1 The Report recommended that the delegates of the GKSA in the General Synod 2009 choose between the YES- and NO-options 'in obedience to Scripture' (Acta 2009:664, 10.15). The Advisory Commission amended this recommendation and gave no justification for the amendment. The amended recommendation proposes that the decision for the YES- or NO-option option be exercised 'after reviewing the Report' and not 'in obedience to Scripture'. And as such the decision was communicated to the churches – 'upon review of the report' the Synod came to the conviction that women may not serve in the special offices of minister and elder (Acta 2009:669, 2).
1.1.3.2 Die verandering van 'in gehoorsaamheid aan die Skrif' na 'in die lig van behandeling van die Rapport' is nie slegs woordspeling of 'n valse onderskeid soos by die Buitengewone Algemene Sinode 2016 beweer is nie (Acta 2016:67, 78, 98, 130, 3.3). Die 2009-besluit kon nie in gehoorsaamheid aan die Skrif geneem word nie. <u>Om 'n keuse te maak tussen twee verskillende teenoorgestelde opsies wat op geloofwaardige en houdbare eksegese berus sou beteken dat daar genoegsame Skrifgetuienis is om vir een</u>	1.1.3.2 The amendment of the expression "in obedience to Scripture" to "upon review of the Report" cannot be put down to mere semantics or to a false distinction as was alleged at the Extraordinary General Synod 2016 (Acta 2016:67, 78, 98,130, 3.3). The 2009-decision could not have been made in obedience to Scripture. <u>To effect a choice between two opposite options, both of which are based on plausible and sustainable exegesis, requires that there be sufficient Scriptural evidence upon which one option is</u>

van die twee opsies te kies. Sodanige Skrifgetuienis bestaan nie en is nie in 2009 voorgelê vir oorweging in die besluitneming nie. Die 2009-besluit is nie in gehoorsaamheid aan die Skrif of op grond van Skrifgegewens in die Rapport geneem nie.

1.2 *Motivering 2 : Beswaargrond 1 – Skrifmotivering : 2016-besluite*
(Verdere beswaar teen die 2016-besluite en die nodige motivering daarvoor word in beswaargrond 4 gegee).

1.2.1 In die Beswaarskrifte deur kerke ingedien teen die 2009-besluit is een van die besware juis dat daar nie Skrifmotivering vir die besluit is nie (Acta 2016:52, 5.1; 63, 3.1; 65, 3.3; 71, 2; 128, 2). Die afgevaardigdes van die GKSA in die Buitengewone Algemene Sinode 2016 besluit om die besware nie te handhaaf nie (Acta 2016:59, 2.11; 70, 4.4.2.1; 81, 4.1.2.1; 100, 4.1.3.1; 133, 4.3.1). Die 2016-besluite word geneem in die lig van aanbevelings van die 'Kommissie Kerkregtelik'. In die bevindings en aanbevelings deur die Kommissie kom informasie voor wat nie waar is nie. Die volgende is 'n voorbeeld hiervan.

1.2.2 Volgens die Kommissie is die beswaar dat Skrifmotivering vir die 2009-besluit ontbreek slegs 'n bewering – 'n stelling wat nie waar is nie, maar vals (Acta 2016:66, 78, 98, 130, 3.2). Die Kommissie sê dat die 2009-besluit juis op grond van die Skrif geneem is (Acta 2016:67, 78, 98, 130, 3.3). Soos hierbo aangedui in C. 1.1.2.4 en 1.1.2.5 is die stelling van die 'Kommissie Kerkregtelik' nie waar nie maar vals. In die lig van hierdie valse stelling, berus die bevinding oor die beswaar dat Skrifmotivering vir die 2009-besluit ontbreek, op informasie wat nie waar is nie. Informasie wat nie waar is nie lei tot verkeerde besluite. Daarom het die 2016-besluite, die kerke se beswaar dat daar nie Skrifmotivering

chosen above the other. Such Scriptural evidence does not exist and was never submitted in 2009 for consideration towards the decision made. The 2009-decision was not made in obedience to Scripture nor on the basis of Scriptural evidence in the Report.

1.2 *Justification 2 : Ground of Objection 1 – Scriptural justification : 2016 decisions*
(Further objection against the 2016 decisions and justification for such objections are supplied in Ground of Objection 4).

1.2.1 Amongst the petitions of Protest submitted by the churches against the 2009-decision, one of the objections was that there was no Scriptural justification for the decision (Acta 2016:52, 5.1; 63, 3.1; 65, 3.3; 71, 2; 128, 2). The delegates of the GKSA in the Extraordinary General Synod 2106 decided to repudiate such objections (Acta 2016: 59, 2.11; 70, 4.4.2.1; 81, 4.1.2.1; 100, 4.1.3.1; 133, 4.3.1). The 2016-decisions were taken in the light of recommendations by the 'Commission Church polity'. Information that is not true is evident in the conclusions and recommendations of this Commission, of which the following is an example.

1.2.2 The Commission states that the 2009-decision was in fact based on Scripture (Acta 2016:67, 78, 98, 130, 3.3). As indicated above in C. 1.1.2.4 and 1.1.2.5 this statement by the 'Commission Church polity' is not true, but false. Consequently, in view of this false allegation, the conclusion regarding the objection against the 2009-decision, is based on information that is not true. Information that is not true leads to erroneous decisions. Therefore, the 2016 decisions wrongly repudiate the protest that the 2009-decision has no Scriptural justification.

vir die 2009-besluit is nie, verkeerdelik afgewys:	
1.2.2.1 Die kerke maak beswaar en sê – daar is nie Skrifmotivering vir die 2009-besluit nie;	1.2.2.1 The churches object and maintain that there is no Scriptural justification for the 2009-decision;
1.2.2.2 Die 'Kommissie Kerkregtelik' se bevindings en aanbevelings skep valslik die indruk dat daar wel Skrifmotivering vir die 2009-besluit is (Acta 2016:67, 78, 98, 130, 3.3);	1.2.2.2 The conclusions and recommend-dations of the 'Commission Church polity' creates the false impression that Scriptural justification for the 2009-decision does exist (Acta 2016:67, 78, 98, 130, 3.3).
1.2.2.3 In die lig hiervan sê die 2016-besluite dat die beswaar nie geldig is nie;	1.2.2.3 In the light hereof the 2016-decisions hold that the objection is invalid.
1.2.2.4 MAAR – die Kommissie en die 2016-besluite bly in gebreke om enige Skrifmotivering vir die 2009-besluit aan te dui;	1.2.2.4 BUT – the Commission and the 2016-decisions fail to point out any Scriptural justification for the 2009 decision.
1.2.2.5 Die beswaar deur die kerke is waar – daar is geen Skrifmotivering vir die 2009-besluit nie;	1.2.2.5 The objection by the churches is valid – there is no Scriptural justification for the 2009-decision.
1.2.3 Die beswaar is verkeerdelik op grond van informasie wat nie waar is nie afgewys – sonder dat die 'Kommissie Kerkregtelik' of die 2016-besluite die Skrifmotivering in en vir die 2009-besluit uitwys.	1.2.3 The objection is wrongly repudiated on account of information that is not true – whilst the 'Commission Church polity' and the 2016-decisions fail to point out any Scriptural justification for the 2009-decision.
1.2.4 Die 2016-besluite kan nie Skrif-motivering vir die 2009-besluit gee nie. Geen Skrifmotivering kan uit Acta 2009 vir die 2009-besluit aangewys word nie. Meerdere vergaderings is tydelik. Spoelstra (1989:210, 3) wys met motivering uit 'n besluit in 1876 geneem (Acta 1876, art 223) dat 'n volgende vergadering nie die besluite van 'n vorige vergadering kan ver-klaar of motiveer nie.	1.2.4 The 2016-decisions cannot supply Scriptural justification for the 2009 decision. No Scriptural justification can be shown from Acta 2009 for the 2009-decision. Major assemblies are temporary bodies. Spoelstra (1989:210,3) points out on the basis of a decision dated 1876 (Acta 1876: art 223), that it is beyond the powers of a subsequent assembly to explain or justify the decisions of previous assemblies.
1.3 *Motivering 3 : Beswaargrond 1 – Riglyne : Godsopenbaring*	1.3 *Justification 3 : Ground of Objection 1 – Guidelines : God's revelation*
1.3.1 Die besluit deur die afgevaardigdes van die GKSA in die Algemene Sinode in 2009 (Acta 2009:667, 4) bedien valse gesag omdat dit in stryd is met God se openbaring in sy Woord en in sy skepping.	1.3.1 The decision by delegates of the Reformed Churches in the General Synod in 2009 (Acta 2009: 667, 4) contradicts God's revelation in Scripture and in creation and therefore administers false authority.
1.3.2 Geen direkte teks uit die Skrif skryf voor dat vroue in die besondere dienste mag dien of nie mag dien nie (Acta 1997:557, 2.2.3; Acta 2003:600, 5.1.1). Daarom moet daar in die verband deeglik rekening gehou word	1.3.2 No direct text from Scripture directs either that women may or may not serve in the Particular offices (Acta 1997:557, 2.2.3; Acta 2003:600, 5.1.1). Consequently, the broad guidelines of God's revelation should be thoroughly accounted for in this

met die breë riglyne in die Godsopenbaring. Die volgende breë riglyne in die Godsopenbaring moet in besluite oor die vrou in die besondere dienste van predikant en ouderling verreken word:	regard. The following broad guidelines in God's revelation must be taken into account in decisions regarding women serving in the particular of minister and elder:
1.3.2.1 Man en vrou is as beeld van God geskep om as sy verteenwoordigers sy heerskappy uit te oefen, in en oor die skepping (Gen 1:26-27). Man en vrou ontvang die opdrag van God en die seën van God om gesag uit te oefen in hulle heerskappy-taak (Gen 1:28; Ps 8:5-9);	1.3.2.1 Both man and woman were created in the image of God and called to rule over God's creation as His representatives (Gen 1:27-27). Both man and woman received God's blessing and command to rule with authority (Gen 1:28; Ps 8:5-9);
1.3.2.2 Die openbaring in die skepping toon duidelik dat gelowige mans en vroue diensbaar is in die Koninkryk van God waar hulle gesag uitoefen in posisies waar hulle leer en regeer – oor mans en oor vroue;	1.3.2.2 God's revelation in creation clearly shows that both men and women serve the Kingdom of God in positions wherever they administer authority in teaching and governing over men and women;
1.3.2.3 Die voorskrifte van die Here bevestig dat mans en vroue die taak en die verantwoordelikheid het vir die uitoefening van gesag in die huis en in die samelewing (Eks 20:12; Deut 5:16);	1.3.2.3 The instructions of the Lord confirm that both men and women have the task and responsibility to exercise authority at home and in society (Ex 20:12; Deut 5:16);
1.3.2.4 Die bedoeling van God met sy volk (mans en vroue) is dieselfde in die Ou- en Nuwe Testament: 'n koninkryk van priesters (Eks 19:5-6; 1 Pet 2:9; Op 1:5-6). In die koninkryk bedien en verkondig gelowige mans en vroue die gesag en heerskappy van God. Daartoe is hulle verlos;	1.3.2.4 In the Old and New Testaments God's purpose for his people is the same – to be a kingdom of priests (Ex 19:5-6;1 Pet 2:9; Rev 1:5-6). In the kingdom believing men and women administer and proclaim the authority and reign of God. Redemption enables them to do this;
1.3.2.5 In die gawes wat God deur Christus en deur die Heilige Gees aan sy kerk gee (Rom 12:4-8; 1 Kor 12 en 14; Ef 4:7-11; 1 Pet 4:7-11) word geen onderskeid gemaak op grond van geslag nie. Aan gelowige mans en vroue word genadegawes (χάρισμα) gegee tot diens om die kerk as liggaam van Christus op te bou. Die gawes om te preek en te leer word nie op grond van geslag aan mans en nie aan vroue gegee nie.	1.3.2.5 God, in giving gifts to his church through Christ and the Holy Spirit, (Rom 12:4-8; 1 Cor 12 en 14; Efe 4:7-11; 1 Pet 4:7-11), makes no distinction on the basis of gender. Gifts (χάρισμα) are bestowed upon faithful men and women to serve and to edify the church as the body of Christ. The gifts to preach and teach are not bestowed upon men but not on women, on account of gender.
1.3.2.6 Gelowige mans en vroue ontvang die belofte om in die hiernamaals saam met Christus te regeer (Op 2:26; 3:21);	1.3.2.6 Believing men and women receive the promise to rule with Christ in life hereafter;
1.3.3 Die Godsopenbaring in die Woord en in die skepping bevestig dat gelowige mans en vroue in die Koninkryk van	1.3.3 God's revelation in Scripture and in creation confirms that believing men and women serve in his Kingdom – now as well as in the life hereafter – to administer and proclaim his

God – hier en in die hiernamaals – diensbaar is om sy gesag uit te oefen en te verkondig. Die 2009-besluit bepaal sonder enige Skrifmotivering dat vroue in die kerk nie in die leer- en regeerdiens van predikante en ouderlinge mag dien nie. Die 2009-besluit wat vroue sonder die nodige Skrifbegronding verbied om diensbaar te wees in die leer- en regeerdiens in die kerk, is in stryd met die Godsopenbaring.

1.3.4 Hoekom word gelowige vroue, diensbaar in die Koninkryk van God, toegelaat om sy gesag in hierdie wêreld te bedien en te verkondig maar nie in die kerk nie? Die 2009-besluit lei tot 'n onhoudbare teenstrydigheid – die gesag van God in sy Koninkryk mag deur mans en vroue bedien word maar alleen mans en nie vroue nie, mag dit in sy kerk doen. Hierdie teenstrydigheid kan nie sonder duidelike Skrifgronde gehandhaaf word nie.

1.3.5 Die 2009-besluit wat sonder Skrifmotivering in stryd is met die breë riglyne van God se openbaring in sy Woord en skepping bedien nie die gesag van God en sy Woord nie, maar valse gesag.

1.4 *Bevinding : Beswaargrond 1*

1.4.1 Christus regeer sy kerk deur sy Woord en Gees (Spoelstra, 1989:462-464, 1). Daar was en is geen motivering uit die Skrif vir die 2009-besluit waarteen beswaar gemaak word, gegee nie.

1.4.2 Die besluit deur die afgevaardigdes van die GKSA in die Algemene Sinode 2009 om vir die NEE-opsie te kies bedien valse gesag want Skrifgronde vir die besluit ontbreek.

1.4.3 'n Kerklike besluit sonder die nodige Skrifmotivering bedien nie die gesag van Christus nie maar valse gesag. Kerklike besluite waarin die gesag van die Woord bedien word, is vas en bindend. "*In die Woord lê die gesag van enige kerklike besluit*" (Du Plooy, 1979:94). 'n Kerklike besluit wat op valse gesag berus kan nie en mag nie deur die kerke as vas en bindend gehou word nie.

authority. The 2009-decision dictates without any Scriptural justification that women may not serve in the churches in the teaching and governing services of ministers and elders. The 2009-decision contradicts God's revelation by prohibiting women from serving in the teaching and governing offices of the church without the necessary Scriptural justification.

1.3.4 Why are believing women serving in the kingdom of God allowed to administer and proclaim his authority in the world, but not in the church? The 2009-decision creates an untenable contradiction - the Lord's authority may be administered in his kingdom by both men and women, but only men may do so in His church. This contradiction cannot be condoned without clear Scriptural evidence to that effect.

1.3.5 The 2009-decision which is in conflict with the broad guidelines of God's revelation in Scripture and in creation, does not administer the authority of God or his Word. It administers a false authority.

1.4 *Conclusion : Ground of Objection 1*

1.4.1 Christ governs his church through his Word and Spirit (Spoelstra, 1988:462-464, 1). There was and is no Scriptural justification for for the 2009-decision, against which objection is made herein.

1.4.2 The decision by delegates of the GKSA in the General Synod 2009, to choose the NO-option, administers false authority as it lacks Scriptural grounds.

1.4.3 An ecclesiastical decision without the necessary Scriptural justification does not administer the authority of Christ, but false authority. Ecclesiastical decisions which administer the authority of Scripture, are fixed and binding. "*In die Woord lê die gesag van enige kerklike besluit*" (Du Plooy, 1979:94). An ecclesiastical decision based on false authority cannot be held to be fixed and binding by the churches.

1.4.4 Uit die Godsopenbaring is dit duidelik dat gelowige mans en vroue – hier en in die hiernamaals en in die Ou en Nuwe Testament – die gesag en heerskappy van God moet bedien en verkondig. Die 2009-besluit wat bepaal dat alleen mans en nie vroue nie die gesag en heerskappy van God in die kerk mag bedien is in stryd met die Godsopenbaring.

1.4.5 Omdat die 2009-besluit in stryd is met die Godsopenbaring lei dit tot 'n onhoudbare teenstrydigheid tussen koninkryk en kerk. In die koninkryk mag mans en vroue die gesag en heerskappy van God bedien en verkondig maar in sy kerk mag vroue dit nie doen nie. In die lig van die teenstrydighede en aangesien geen motivering en geen Skrifmotivering vir die 2009-besluit gegee is nie, bedien die 2009-besluit nie die gesag van God en sy Woord nie, maar valse gesag.

2. Beswaargrond 2 – Valse gesag : Belydenis

Die besluit deur die afgevaardigdes van die GKSA in die Algemene Sinode in 2009 (Acta 2009:667, 4) bedien valse gesag in die lig van die Belydenis (NGB, artt 7, 29 en 32).

2.1 *Motivering 1 : Beswaargrond 2 – Belydenis : 2009-besluit*

2.1.1 Geen direkte teks uit die Skrif skryf voor dat vroue in die besondere dienste mag dien of nie mag dien nie (Acta 1997:557, 2.2.3; Acta 2003:600, 5.1.1). In na-spreke van die Skrif, maak die Belydenisskrifte geen uitspraak vir of teen die vrou in die besondere dienste nie (Acta 1988:516, 3.3.2).

2.1.2 Die saak van die vrou in die besondere dienste van predikante en ouderlinge is opsigself nie 'n belydenis saak nie (Acta 2009:664, 10.16.2). Daarom het die afgevaardigdes van die GKSA in die Nasionale Sinode in 1988 tot die bevinding gekom dat:

"Wanneer kerke na langdurige en biddende bestudering van die Skrif

1.4.4 Believing men and women have to administer and proclaim the authority and rule of God, now and in the life hereafter. This much is clear from God's revelation – in the Old and New Testaments. The 2009-decision that allows only men to administer God's authority and rule in the church, but excludes women from doing so, contradicts God's revelation.

1.4.5 Because the 2009-decision contradicts the Lord's revelation, it promotes an untenable contradiction between kingdom and church. In the kingdom both men and women may administer and proclaim the authority and rule of God, but women may not do so in church. Due to this contradiction and as the 2009-decision lacks Scriptural justification, the 2009-decision administers false authority and not the authority of God and his Word.

2. Ground of Objection 2 – False authority : Confession

In the light of our Confession (BC, arts 7, 29 and 32), the 2009-decision by delegates of GKSA in the General Synod in 2009 (Acta 2009: 667, 4), administer false authority.

2.1 *Justification 1 : Ground of Objection 2 – Confession : 2009-decision*

2.1.1 No direct text from Scripture directs either that women may or may not serve in the particular services of the church (Acta 1997:557, 2.2.3; Acta 2003:600, 5.1.1). Echoing Scripture, the Confessions also contain no judgment for or against women in the particular services (Acta 1988:516, 3.3.2).

2.1.2 The matter of women serving in the particular offices of ministers and of elders is in itself not a Confessional one (Acta 2009:664, 10.16.2). This is the very reason why the delegates of the GKSA in the National Synod in 1988 came to the conclusion that:

(Free translation from Afrikaans)

"*When, after prolonged, prayerful study of Scripture under guidance by the Holy Spirit, the churches may*

onder leiding van die Heilige Gees tot die slotsom kom dat vrouens wel in 'n besonder amp mag dien, sal moeilik beweer kan word dat so 'n besluit strydig is met Reformatoriese Belydenisskrifte – hoogstens dat dit in spanning is met Gereformeerde tradisie" (Acta 1988:516, 3.3.3). Tot op hede het die kerke, ten opsigte van die Belydenis en die vrou in die besondere dienste, tot geen ander bevinding gekom nie.	*come to the conclusion that women may in fact serve in particular offices, it will be difficult to maintain that such decision would be in conflict with the Reformed Confessions. At most, it could be said that it would not be in keeping with Reformed tradition* (Acta 1988:516, 3.3.3)". So far, the churches have not come to any other conclusion concerning the Confession and women in the particular offices.
2.1.3 Die 2009-besluit gaan, sonder enige Skrif-, Belydenis- en Kerkorde-begronding, verder as die Skrif en die Belydenis deur vroue uit te sluit van die besondere dienste van predikante en ouderlinge.	2.1.3 The 2009-decision exceeds, without any justification from Scripture, Confession or the Church Order, the boundaries of Scripture and the Confession by excluding women from the particular offices of ministers and of elders.
2.2 *Motivering 2 : Beswaargrond 2 – NGB, artt 7, 29 en 32*	2.2 *Justification 2 : Ground of objection 2 – BC, arts 7, 29 and 32*
2.2.1 <u>NGB, art 7</u>	2.2.1 <u>BC, art 7</u>
2.2.1.1 Die Skrif bevat die wil van God volkome en die wyse waarop God deur ons gedien moet word, word breedvoerig daarin beskryf (NGB, art 7). Geen direkte teks uit die Skrif bepaal dat vroue in die besondere dienste mag dien of nie mag dien nie (Acta 2003:600, 5.1.1; Acta 1997:557, 2.2.3).	2.2.1.1 Holy Scripture fully contains the will of God and whatsoever man should believe is sufficiently taught therein (BC, art 7). No direct text from Scripture directs that women may or may not serve in the particular services (Acta 1997:557, 2.2.3; Acta 2003:600, 5.1.1).
2.2.1.2 Met die 2009-besluit wat sonder enige gronde verder gaan as die Skrif, is die bepaling dat vroue nie in die besondere dienste van predikante en ouderlinge mag dien nie, 'n byvoeging by die Skrif en in stryd met die Belydenis (NGB, art 7).	2.2.1.2 The 2009-decision, lacking any justification that women may not serve in the particular services of ministers and elders exceeds the boundaries of Holy Scripture. This stipulation constitutes an addition to Scripture in conflict with the Confession (BC, art 7).
2.2.1.3 Die 2009-besluit wat geen Skrif-motivering het nie, bedien nie die gesag van die Skrif nie. In stryd met ons Belydenis word valse gesag met die 2009-besluit, die valse gesag van groot getalle (NGB, art 7), gelyk gestel met die gesag van die Skrif want die besluit word valslik voorgehou as 'n besluit wat die gesag van die Skrif bedien.	2.2.1.3 The 2009-decision, lacking any Scriptural justification, does not administer the authority of Scripture. In conflict with our Confession, the 2009-decision administers the false authority of large numbers (BC, art 7) and equates that to the authority of Scripture by falsely presenting that decision as one bearing the authority of Scripture.
2.2.2 <u>NGB, art 29</u>	2.2.2 <u>BC, art 29</u>
2.2.2.1 Die 2009-besluit is nie, soos van die	2.2.2.1 The 2009-decision was not taken according to Scripture, as is

ware kerk gevra (NGB, art 29), ooreenkomstig die Skrif geneem nie. Die waarskuwing dat die valse kerk aan sy besluite meer mag en gesag toeskryf as aan die Woord van God (NGB, art 29) moet ten opsigte van die 2009-besluit ernstig opgeneem word omdat daar geen Skrif-, Belydenis- en Kerkorde-begronding vir die besluit gegee is nie.	required of the true church to do (BC, art 29).The warning that the false church ascribes more power and authority to herself and her ordinances than to the Word of God, must be taken seriously with respect to the 2009-decision, because no Scriptural, Confessional or Church Order grounds were given for the decision.
2.2.3 <u>NGB, art 32</u>	2.2.3 <u>BC, art 32</u>
2.2.3.1 Sonder enige geldige motivering gaan die 2009-besluit (Acta 2009:667, 4) verder as die Skrif en Belydenis en bepaal dat vroue nie in die besondere dienste van predikante en ouderlinge mag dien nie. Omdat die 2009-besluit nie op die Skrif gegrond nie is die besluit, soos ons bely, 'n menslike wet wat gewetens bind (NGB, art 32).	2.2.3.1 Lacking any valid justification, the 2009-decision (Acta 2009:667, 4) exceeds the boundaries of Scripture and the Confession, prohibiting women from serving in the particular offices of ministers and elders. Because the 2009-decision has no Scriptural justification, the decision is, according to our Confession, a man-made law imposed to bind and force our consciences (BC, art 32).
2.2.3.2 Kerklike besluite wat in die lig van NGB, art 32 menslike wette is, lei tot menslike heerskappyvoering in die kerk waardeur die gesag en regering van Christus verdring word. Besluite wat tot menslike heerskappyvoering lei bedien valse gesag en kan daarom nie deur die kerke as vas en bindend aanvaar word nie.	2.2.3.2 Ecclesiastical decisions which conflict with BC, art 32, are man-made inventions resulting in human dominion in the church and the ousting of the authority and rule of Christ. Decisions that lead to human dominion administer a false authority and can therefore not be accepted by the churches as fixed and binding.
2.3 *Motivering 3 : Beswaargrond 2 – Belydenis : 2016-besluite*	2.3 *Justification 3 : Ground of Objection 2 – Confession : 2016 decisions*
2.3.1 Die 'Kommissie Kerkregtelik' se opmerkings en bevindings by die Buitengewone Algemene Sinode 2016 in verband met gewetensbinding en NGB, art 32 is nie die waarheid nie. (Acta 2016:67, 79, 99, 131, 3.8; 80, 4.1.1.1, 4.1.1.3).	2.3.1 Comments and conclusions by the 'Commission Church polity' at the Extraordinary General Synod 2016, concerning the constraint of conscience and BC, art 32 boil down to information that is not true (Acta 2016:67, 79, 99, 131, 3.8; 80, 4.1.1.1, 4.1.1.3).
2.3.2 Die beswaar dat besluit wat nie op die gesag van die Skrif berus nie tot gewetensbinding lei word afgemaak as ongeldig (Acta 2016:67, 79, 99, 131, 3.8). Die beoordeling is nie waar nie maar vals.	2.3.2 The objection that decisions unsupported by Scripture impose a constraint on our consciences is rejected by the Commission as invalid. This judgement is not justified.
2.3.3 Tereg sê die Kommissie dat besluite wat met meerderheidstem op grond van Skrif, Belydenis en Kerkorde	2.3.3 The Commission correctly states that decisions by majority vote, taken on the basis of Scripture, Confession and the Church Order,

geneem word, nie heers en gewetens bind nie, want dan regeer die Skrif. Hierdeur word die indruk geskep dat die 2009-besluit op grond van Skrif, Belydenis en Kerkorde geneem is, dat Skrifgesag in die besluit bedien en dat die besluit nie gewetens kan bind nie. Hierdie indruk wat geskep word, is vals. Die Kommissie het nie aangetoon nie en kan nie aantoon dat die 2009-besluit op grond van die Skrif, Belydenis of Kerkorde geneem is nie.	cannot bind our consciences, as that is when Scripture governs. But in so stating, the impression is created that the 2009 decision was taken on the basis of the Scripture, Confession and the Church Order, that Scriptural authority is administered in the decision and that the decision cannot constrain our consciences. This impression is false. The Commission did not and cannot show that the 2009-decision was taken on the basis of Scripture, Confession and the Church Order.
2.3.4 Die 'Kommissie Kerkregtelik' gebruik informasie wat nie waar is nie om die beswaar deur GK Krugersdorp dat die 2009-besluit die gewetens bind (NGB, art 32), af te wys (Acta 2016:80-81, 4.1).	2.3.4 The 'Commission Church polity' employs information that is not true to repudiate (Acta 2016:80-81, 4.1) the protest by GK Krugersdorp to the effect that the 2009-decision constrains conscience (BC, art 32).
2.3.5 Die Kommissie se verwysing (Acta 2016:80, 4.1.1.6), dat die Beswaarskrif se verwysing na NGB, art 32 dat groot getalle gewetens bind, is nie waar nie. Die verwysing na die gevaar van groot getalle word nie deur die beswaar in die lig van NGB, art 32 gemaak nie maar in die lig van NGB, art 7 (Acta 2016:72, 2.3).	2.3.5 The reference by the Commission (Acta 2016:80, 4.1.1.6) that the citation from BC, art 32 in the Petition of protest – not to constrain conscience by the majority – is untenable. The reference to the danger of the majority (large numbers) is however, correctly made by the Petition of protest in accordance with BC, art 7 (Acta 2016:72, 2.3).
2.3.6 Die Kommissie verdraai die bedoeling van beswaargrond 1. In beswaargrond 1 (Acta 2016:71-72, 2) word beswaar gemaak teen die 2009-besluit omdat die besluit gewetens bind (NGB, art 32) op gesag van die meerderheidstem (NGB, art 7 – groot getalle) en nie op gesag van die Skrif nie (NGB, art 7 – volkomenheid van die Skrif). Die bedoeling van die beswaargrond was nie om – soos deur die Kommissie verdraai (Acta 2016:80, 4.1.1.6) – op grond van die Skrif aan te toon dat vroue in die besondere dienste van predikante en ouderlinge mag dien nie. Die verdraaiing deur die Kommissie is 'n wanvoorstelling van die waarheid.	2.3.6 The Commission misrepresents the intention behind ground of objection 1. In ground of objection 1 (Acta 2016:71-72, 2), objection is made against the 2009-decision on account of the decision constraining conscience (BC, art 32) on the strength of the majority (BC, art 7 – "great multitude") and not on the authority of Scripture (BC, art 7 – the sufficiency of Scripture). The intention behind this ground of objection was not, as the Commission mis-represents it, to show in the light of Scripture that women may be ordained as elders or ministers.
2.3.7 Die geldige beswaar dat Skrifmotivering vir 2009-besluit ontbreek word afgewys op grond van die ongeldige, valse en verdraaide bevinding deur die 'Kommissie Kerk-	2.3.7 The very valid objection that the 2009-decision lacks Scriptural justification is rejected on the strength of the 'Commission Church polity's' invalid, false and distorted conclusion that the Petition does not

regtelik' dat die beswaar nie op grond van die Skrif aantoon dat vroue in die besondere dienste mag dien nie.

2.4 *Bevinding : Beswaargrond 2*

2.4.1 Nie die Skrif of die Belydenis maak direkte uitsprake oor of vroue in die besondere dienste van predikante en ouderlinge mag dien of nie mag dien nie.

2.4.2 Die 2009-besluit gaan verder as die Skrif en die Belydenis en bepaal dat vroue nie in die besondere dienste van predikante en ouderlinge mag dien nie. Die 2009-besluit is in stryd met die Belydenis omdat die besluit sonder enige motivering en sonder enige Skrifmotivering:

2.4.2.1 'n byvoeging by die Skrif maak waardeur die wyse waarop God deur ons gedien moet word, uitgebrei word. Met die uitbreiding kom die volkomenheid van die Skrif in gedrang (NGB, art 7);

2.4.2.2 met die valse gesag van groot getalle (NGB, art 7) valslik voorgehou word as 'n besluit wat die gesag van die Skrif bedien;

2.4.2.3 die valse gesag bedien waarteen die Belydenis ons waarsku (NGB, art 29);

2.4.2.4 niks anders is nie as 'n menslike wet wat gewetens bind (NGB, art 32).

2.4.3 Die 2016-besluite wys die beswaar, dat die 2009-besluit in stryd met die Belydenis is (NGB, artt 7 en 32), verkeerdelik af, omdat die 2016-besluite op informasie berus wat nie waar is nie.

2.4.4 Die 2009-besluit is in stryd met die Belydenis (NGB, artt 7, 29, en 32) en bedien valse gesag. Die besluit wat valse gesag bedien kan en mag nie deur die as vas en bindend gehou word nie.

3. Beswaargrond 3 – Valse gesag : Kerkorde

Die besluit deur die afgevaardigdes van die GKSA in die Algemene Sinode in

indicate Scriptural authority for the viewpoint that women may serve in the particular services of the church.

2.4 *Conclusion : Ground of Objection 2*

2.4.1 Neither Scripture nor the Confession expresses preference for or against women serving in the particular offices of ministers and elders.

2.4.2 The 2009-decision goes beyond Scripture and the Confession, deciding that women may not serve in the particular offices of ministers or elders. The 2009-decision is in conflict with the Confession, as the lack of any justification and specifically the lack of Scriptural justification, causes the following:

2.4.2.1 it adds to Scripture, expanding the way in which we are called to worship God. This expansion undermines the sufficiency of Scripture (BC, art 7).

2.4.2.2 with the false authority of the majority (large numbers – BC, art 7) the 2009-decision is falsely presented as a decision administering the authority of Scripture.

2.4.2.3 it administers a false authority, against which the Confession warns us (BC art 29).

2.4.2.4 it boils down to nothing more that a human law to bind and compel consciences (BC art 32).

2.4.3 The 2016-decisions wrongly repudiate the objection – that the 2009 decision conflicts with the Confession (BC, arts 7 and 32) – because the 2016 decisions are based on information that is not true.

2.4.4 The 2009-decision is in conflict with the Confession (BC, arts 7, 29, 32) and administers false authority. This decision that administers false authority cannot and may not be held as fixed and binding by the GKSA.

3. Ground of Objection 3 – False Authority : Church Order

Viewed in the light of Presbyterian principles of church governance and the Church Order, the decision by the

2009 (Acta 2009:667, 4) bedien valse gesag in die lig van die Presbiteriale kerkregering en die Kerkorde.

3.1 *Motivering 1 : Beswaargrond 3 – Valse gesag : Kollegialisme*
Die besluit deur die afgevaardigdes van die GKSA in die Algemene Sinode in 2009 (Acta 2009:667, 4) bedien valse gesag in die lig van die Presbiteriale kerkregering want dit bedien die valse gesag van die kollegialisme.

3.1.1 Valse gesag : Kollegialisme

3.1.1.1 In die kollegialistiese wyse van kerkregering setel die kerklike gesag in die struktuur, die vergadering. 'n Besluit is gesagvol omdat 'n kerklike vergadering (bv 'n Klassis of Sinode) die besluit geneem het.

3.1.1.2 Daar is kerke wat 'n kollegialistiese wyse van kerkregering aanvaar. In en vir die wat 'n Presbiteriale wyse van kerkregering aanvaar het, is kollegialistiese gesag, valse gesag.

3.1.2 2009-besluit : Valse gesag van kollegialisme

3.1.2.1 In die besluit waarteen beswaar gemaak word (Acta 2009:667, 4), sê die afgevaardigdes van die GKSA in Sinode 2009 dat die SINODE in die lig van die behandeling van die Rapport tot die oortuiging gekom het om die NEE-opsie te kies. Die Sinode het besluit. Omdat Skrifmotivering vir die besluit ontbreek bedien die besluit die gesag van die Sinode as vergadering – kollegialistiese gesag. Besluite wat kollegialistiese gesag bedien, bedien valse gesag.

3.1.2.2 Die 'hoekom-vraag' wat ons by die oorsprong van die gesag bring, bevestig die kollegialistiese gesag wat die 2009-bedien:
Vraag: Hoekom mag vroue volgens die besluit deur die afgevaardigdes in die Algemene Sinode 2009 nie in die besondere dienste van predikant en ouderling dien nie?
Antwoord: Omdat die Sinode so besluit het.

delegates of the GKSA in the General Synod in 2009 (Acta 2009:667, 4) administers false authority.

3.1 *Justification 1 : Ground of Objection 3 – False authority : Collegialism.*
The decision by delegates of the GKSA in the General Synod in 2009 (Acta 2009:667, 4) administers false authority in view of Presbyterian church governance because it administers the false authority of collegialism.

3.1.1 False Authority : Collegialism

3.1.1.1 In collegialism the authority in governing the church vests in the structure, the assembly. Accordingly, a decision is authoritative on account of it having been made by an ecclesiastic assembly (eg. a Classis or Synod).

3.1.1.2 There are churches who accept collegialism as method of church government. In and for the Reformed Churches, which have adopted the Presbyterian system of church government, collegialistic authority is false authority.

3.1.2 2009-decision : False authority of collegialism

3.1.2.1 In the decision against which objection is leveled (Acta 2009:667, 4), the delegates of the GKSA in the General Synod 2009 state that the SYNOD came to the conclusion to choose the NO-option. The Synod decided. As the decision lacks Scriptural justification, the decision administers the authority of the Synod as an assembly, being collegialistic authority. Decisions that administer collegialistic authority, administer false authority.

3.1.2.2 The 'why-question' points to the origin of the authority and confirms the collegialistic authority administered by the 2009-decision"
Question: Why may women, according to the decision of the delegates in the General Synod 2009, not serve in the particular offices of minister and elders?
Answer: Because the Synod so decided.

3.1.2.3 No other reply presents itself to the

3.1.2.3 Geen ander antwoord – as miskien die valse gesag van die meerderheidstem – kan op die vraag gegee word nie. Omdat geen motivering en geen Skrifmotivering vir die besluit gegee is nie, bedien die 2009-besluit valse kollegialistiese gesag – die gesag van die Sinode as vergadering.	above question – barring, perhaps, the false authority of the majority vote. Because no justification and no Scriptural justification is supplied for the decision, the 2009-decision administers false collegialistic authority – the authority of the Synod as an assembly.
3.1.2.4 Dat die valse gesag van kollegialisme 'n bedreiging is vir besluitneming deur die word bevestig deur die volgende:	3.1.2.4 The following considerations confirm that the false authority of collegialism presents a threat to decision-making in the GKSA:
3.1.2.4.1 'n Opvallende verskil tussen die Handelinge van vroeëre Sinodes en die van die afgelope paar Sinodes. Die Handelinge van vroeëre Sinodes wys dat duidelike motivering vir besluite gegee word (Acta 1988:519, 3.6.2-3.6.5). In die Handelinge van latere Sinodes word geen motivering vir besluite gegee nie (Acta 2009:667, 4; Acta 2016:69-70, 4.2.2.1, 4.3.2.1, 4.4.2.1, 4.5.2.1, 4.6.2).	3.1.2.4.1 An obvious difference between the Acts of previous Synods and those of the last few years. The Acts of previous Synods show that clear justification for decisions is supplied (Acta 1988:519, 3.6.2-3.6.5). In the Acts of recent Synods, no justification for decisions is supplied (Acta 2009:667, 4; Acta 2016:69-70, 4.2.2.1, 4.3.2.1, 4.4.2.1, 4.5.2.1, 4.6.2).
3.1.2.4.2 Die gesag van 'n kerklike besluit berus op die motivering vir die besluit. Daarom is duidelike motivering van kerklike besluite noodsaaklik (Spoelstra 1989:195-196, 5). Sonder motivering berus die besluit op die kollegialistiese gesag van die vergadering waardeur die besluit geneem is.	3.1.2.4.2 The authority of an ecclesiastical decision depends on its justify-cation. That is why clear justify-cation of ecclesiastical decisions is indispensable (Spoelstra 1989:195, 5). In the absence of justification the authority of a decision is based on the collegialistic authority of the assembly.
3.1.2.4.3 'n Wesentlike verskuiwing vind plaas ten opsigte van kerklike besluite oor sake. Al meer word die vraag gevra *'Wat sê die Sinode oor die saak?*'. Al minder word die vraag gehoor: '*Wat sê die Skrif oor die saak?'*. Hierdeur verskuif die gesag van die Skrif na die Sinode. Skrifgesag maak plek vir die valse kollegialistiese gesag van die Sinode as vergadering. In Presbiteriale kerkregering is dit meer korrek om te vra: *'Wat sê die kerke wat in die Sinode vergader in die lig van die Skrif oor die saak?*'	3.1.2.4.3 A substantial shift has taken place in connection with church decisions. More often that not, the question is put as to what Synod has to say about a matter. The question as to what Scripture says about a matter is less often raised. This indicates a shift in the origin of authority, from Scripture to the Synod. Scriptural authority is being ousted by the false collegialistic authority of the Synod as an assembly. In terms of Presbyterian church governance it would be more appropriately to ask: *'What do the churches, who are meeting in a Synod, say about this matter in light of Scripture?'*.
	3.1.3 <u>2016-decisions : False authority of</u>

3.1.3 2016-besluite : Valse gesag van Kollegialisme	Collegialism
3.1.3.1 Die bevindings en aanbevelings van die 'Kommissie Kerkregtelik' by die Buitengewone Algemene Sinode 2016 bevestig die kollegialistiese gesag van die 2009-besluit. Die Kommissie laat die klem val op die Sinode wat besluit en nie op die gronde vir die besluit nie: *Die Sinode maak 'n keuse* (Acta 2016:66, 78, 98, 130, 3.2); *'n Sinode neem besluite* (Acta 2016:67, 79, 98, 130, 3.4); *Die kerke moet studeer en hul studie deur die Sinode laat toets* (Acta 2016:67, 79, 98, 131, 3.6); *Sinode 2015 het besluit dat die saak van die vrou 'n wesentlike saak is en die besluit moet as vas en bindend gehou word* (Acta 2016:68, 80, 99, 131, 3.14); *Die Sinode het 'n besluit geneem en daardeur het die Sinode geoordeel dat een standpunt korrek is* (Acta 2016:68, 4.1.1.1).	3.1.3.1 The conclusions and recommendations of the 'Commission Church polity at the Extraordinary General Synod 2016 confirm the collegialistic authority of the 2009-decision. The Commission emphasizes the Synod that took the decision and not the justification for the decision: *The Synod chose (Acta 2016:66, 78, 98, 130 - 3.2);* *A Synod makes decisions (Acta 2016:67, 79, 98, 130 - 3.4);* *The churches should study and have their studies tested by the Synod (Acta 2016:67, 79, 98, 131 - 3.6);* *Synod 2015 however decided that it is in fact an essential or principle matter; this decision must be seen as binding (Acta 2016:68, 80, 99, 131, 3.14);* *The Synod made a decision. By doing so, the Synod judged that the one point of view is correct. (Acta 2016:68, 4.1.1.1).*
3.1.3.2 Die Kommissie sê Sinodebesluite het gesag. Die Sinode word teenoor die kerke gestel. Kollegialisties moet die kerke hulle studie deur die Sinode laat toets en hulle aan die gesag van die Sinode onderwerp. Sinodebesluite is kollegialisties vas en bindend vir die kerke omdat die Sinode so besluit het. Die Sinode hoef geen motivering vir besluite te gee nie. Kollegialisties lê die gesag van 'n besluit nie in sy motivering nie maar in die Sinode wat die besluit geneem het.	3.1.3.2 The Commission says that Synod decisions have authority. The Synod is contrasted with the churches. The Commission proclaims that the churches should have their studies tested by the Synod and submit (collegialism) to the authority of Synod. In collegialism Synod decisions are fixed and binding because Synod so decided, irrespective of their justification. In collegialism the authority of a decision is based not in its justification but in the Synod that took the decision.
3.1.3.3 Die 'Kommissie Kerkregtelik' se poging (Acta 2016:67, 79, 99, 131, 3.10; 80, 4.1.1.5), om kollegialistiese gesag in die 2009-besluit af te wys bevestig die teendeel. Tereg sê die Kommissie dat kerke in meerdere vergaderings, in ooreenstemming met Presbiteriale kerkregering, saam besluite neem op grond van Skrif, Belydenis en Kerkorde. Presbiteriaal berus die gesag van 'n kerklike besluit in die motivering van	3.1.3.3 The attempt by the 'Commission Church polity' to deny (Acta 2016:67, 79, 99, 131, 3.10; 80, 4.1.1.5), the collegialistic authority behind the 2009-decision, confirms just the opposite. Quite correctly the Commission maintains that churches assembled in major assemblies, together take decisions in accordance with Scripture, the Confession and the Church Order. This is in compliance with principles of Presbyterian Church

die besluit. Kollegialisties kan motivering vir ‘n besluit ontbreek want die gesag van ‘n besluit berus op die gesag van die Sinode as vergadering. Wanneer geldige motivering vir ‘n besluit ontbreek – wanneer daar nie Skrif-, Belydenis- en Kerkorde-begronding vir ‘n besluit is nie, bedien die besluit die kollegialistiese gesag van die vergadering wat die besluit geneem het.	governance. According to Presbyterian governance, the authority of a decision derives from its justification. According to collegialism, a decision may lack justification because the authority behind a decision resides in the Synod as an assembly. When an ecclesiastic decision lacks sound justification, when justification based on Scripture, the Confession or the Church Order is absent, the decision administers the authority of the assembly which takes the decision.
3.1.3.4 Vir die 2009-besluit is geen Skrif-, Belydenis-,en Kerkorde-begronding gegee nie. Daarom bedien die besluit valse kollegialistiese gesag.	3.1.3.4 No justification from Scripture, the Confession or from the Church Order is supplied for the 2009 decision. Consequently, that decision administers false, collegialistic authority.
3.1.4 <u>Bevinding : Motivering 1 – Beswaargrond 3</u>	3.1.4 <u>Conclusion : Justification 1 – Ground of Objection 3</u>
3.1.4.1 In Presbiteriale kerkregering gee die Sinode as vergadering nie gesag aan besluite nie. Vir die berus besluite wat die kollegialistiese gesag van die vergadering bedien, op valse gesag.	3.1.4.1 According to precepts of Presbyterial church governance, the Synod as assembly does not bestow authority on its decisions. For the GKSA, decisions which administer collegialistic authority of an assembly, administer false authority.
3.1.4.2 Aangesien Skrif-, Belydenis- en Kerkorde-begronding vir die 2009-besluit ontbreek bedien die besluit kollegialistiese gesag – die gesag van die vergadering.	3.1.4.2 As the 2009-decision lacks justification from Scripture, the Confession and the Church Order, the decision administers collegialistic authority of the assembly.
3.1.4.3 Indien kerke die 2009-besluit as vas en bindend moet beskou NET omdat die Sinode die besluit geneem het, kom dit neer op die afdwing van valse kollegialistiese gesag soos Spoelstra (1989:189, 3) dit aandui “*Synodus locuta est causa finita est* (Sinode het gepraat, die saak is besluit)”.	3.1.4.3 If churches have to accept the decision as fixed and binding ONLY because the Synod took the decision, it boils down to enforcing false collegialistic authority, as Spoelstra puts it (1989:189, 3): “*Synodus locuta est causa finita est* (Synod has spoken, the matter is decided)”.
3.1.4.4 Die 2016-besluite wys die beswaar teen kollegialisme in die 2009-besluit af sonder geldige motivering en sonder om die Skrifgesag vir die besluit te bevestig.	3.1.4.4 The 2016-decisions reject the objection against collegialism in the 2009-decision without valid justification and without confirming the Scriptural justification for the decision.
3.1.4.5 ‘n Kerklike besluit wat op die valse gesag van die kollegialisme berus kan en mag nie deur die as vas en	3.1.4.5 A church decision based on the false authority of collegialism cannot and should not be held to be fixed and binding by the GKSA.

bindend gehou word nie.	
3.2 *Motivering 2 : Beswaargrond 3 – Valse gesag : Meerderheidstem* Die besluit deur die afgevaardigdes van die GKSA in die Algemene Sinode in 2009 (Acta 2009:667, 4) bedien valse gesag in die lig van die Kerkorde omdat die besluit die valse gesag van die meerderheidstem bedien.	3.2 *Justification 2 : Ground of Objection 3 – False authority : Majority vote* The decision by the delegates of the GKSA in the General Synod 2009 (Acta 2009:667, 4) administers false authority in the light of the CO because the decision administers the false authority of the majority vote.
3.2.1 <u>Valse gesag : Meerderheidstem</u>	3.2.1 <u>False Authority : Majority Vote</u>
3.2.1.1 Meerderheidstem is die wyse waarop die kerke besluite neem (KO, art 31). In die Presbiteriale kerkregering verleen die meerderheidstem nie gesag aan besluite nie. 'n Kerklike besluit het nie bindende gesag bloot omdat die meerderheid so besluit het nie. Die gesag wat 'n kerklike besluit bedien is nie afhanklik, van waar (Sinode) of hoe (met meerderheid van stemme) die besluit geneem is nie, maar van die motivering / gronde vir die besluit.	3.2.1.1 Churches take decisions by majority vote (CO, art 31). In Presbyterial church governance the vote of the majority does not bestow authority on decisions. An ecclesiastic decision has no binding authority merely because it represents the vote of the majority. The authority administered by an ecclesiastic decision is dependent upon the grounds on which is it justified, not on where (the Synod) or how (by majority vote) the decision is arrived at.
3.2.1.2 In die demokrasie setel die gesag van besluite in die stem van die meerderheid (Spoelstra 1989:205, 2). In 'n teokrasie – in die kerk waar Christus regeer – setel die gesag van besluite in die begronding daarvan. 'n Besluit wat met die nodige Skrif-, Belydenis- en Kerkorde-begronding geneem is, is vas en bindend (KO, art 33). Indien 'n besluit sonder enige Skrif-, Belydenis- en Kerkorde-begronding op die gesag van die meerderheidstem berus, bedien die besluit die valse gesag van die meerderheidstem.	3.2.1.2 In a democracy the authority of resolutions resides in the vote of the majority. In a theocracy – in the church where Christ reigns – the authority of decisions resides in the foundation thereof. A decision arrived at on the necessary foundation of Scripture, the Confession and the Church Order, is fixed and binding (Art 33 CO). A decision without any foundation in Scripture, the Confession or the Church Order that is taken by majority vote, administers the false authority of the majority vote.
3.2.2 <u>2009-besluit : Valse gesag van die meerderheidstem</u>	3.2.2 <u>2009-decision: False authority of the majority vote</u>
3.2.2.1 Die 2009-besluit is met meerderheid van stemme geneem. Geen Skrif-, Belydenis- en Kerkorde-begronding is vir die besluit gegee nie. Daarom word die gesag van die besluit deur die kerke bevraagteken: 'Berus die gesag van die 2009-besluit op die valse gesag van die meerderheidstem?'	3.2.2.1 The 2009-decision was taken by means of the majority vote. No foundation in Scripture, the Confession or the Church Order was supplied for this decision. The reason why the churches question the authority thereof is because its authority is derived from the majority vote.
3.2.2.2 Weer bevestig die hoekom-vraag die valse gesag van die 2009-besluit: *Vraag:* Hoekom mag vroue volgens	3.2.2.2 The 'why question' once again confirms the false authority administered in the 2009-decision: *Question*: Why may women, according to the decision by the

die besluit deur die afgevaardigdes in die Algemene Sinode 2009 nie in die besondere dienste van predikant en ouderling dien nie? *Antwoord:* Omdat die meerderheid so besluit het.	delegates in the General Synod 2009, not serve in the particular offices of ministers and elders? *Answer*: Because the majority so decided.
3.2.2.3 Geen geldige gronde uit die Skrif, Belydenis en Kerkorde is vir die 2009-besluit gegee nie. Daarom bedien die 2009-besluit die valse gesag van die meerderheidstem.	3.2.2.3 The 2009-decision has no valid foundation at all in Scripture, the Confession or the Church Order. Consequently the decision administers false authority – the false authority of the majority vote.
3.2.3 <u>2016-besluite : Valse gesag van die meerderheidstem</u>	3.2.3 <u>2016-decisions: False authority of the Majority Vote</u>
3.2.3.1 By die Buitengewone Algemene Sinode in 2016 word verskeie besware teen die valse gesag van die meerderheidstem in die 2009-besluit beoordeel (Acta 2016:63, 2; 71, 2; 128, 2). Die besware is eenstemmig dat die 2009-besluit in die afwesigheid van duidelike Skrifgronde met die gesag van die meerderheidstem op die kerke afgedwing word (Acta 2016: 64-65, 3.1 en 3.2; 71, 2.2; 129, 3.6 en 3.7).	3.2.3.1 At the Extraordinary General Synod in 2016 several objections against the false authority of the majority vote in the 2009-decision, were adjudicated (Acta 2016:63, 2; 71, 2; 128, 2). The objections were unanimous to the effect that in the absence of clear justification from Scripture, the Confession or from the Church Order, the 2009-decision is forced on the churches on the authority of a majority vote (Acta 2016: 64-65, 3.1 and 3.2;71, 2.2; 129, 3.6 and 3.7).
3.2.3.2 Die besware teen die valse gesag van die meerderheidstem word op grond van informasie wat nie waar is nie deur die 'Kommissie Kerkregtelik' afgewys.	3.2.3.2 Objections against the false authority of the majority vote were repudiated on account of information from the 'Commission Church polity' that is not true.
3.2.3.3 Die Kommissie verwys na die beswaar dat die 2009-besluit sonder enige motivering, een standpunt met meerderheidstem op die minderheid afdwing (Acta 2016:66, 78, 98, 130, 3.2). Die Kommissie gaan egter nie verder op die beswaar in nie en gee geen rede waarom die beswaar nie geldig is nie.	3.2.3.3 The Commission refers to the objection that the 2009 decision enforces one viewpoint upon the minority, by majority vote, without any justification (Acta 2016:66, 78, 98, 130, 3.2). However, the Commission gives no further consideration to the objection and also supplies no reason for holding the objection to be invalid.
3.2.3.4 Die beswaar dat gewetensbinding plaasvind wanneer die gesag van besluite op die meerderheidstem en nie op Skrif berus nie, word afgemaak as ongeldig – 'n beoordeling wat self nie waar is nie (Acta 2016:67, 79, 99, 131, 3.8; 80, 4.1.1.1, 4.1.1.3). Geen bewyse word hiervoor gegee nie.	3.2.3.4 The objection that a constraint on conscience is perpetrated whenever the authority of a decision is founded on a majority vote and not on Scripture – is repudiated as being invalid. This contention is untrue (Acta 2016:67, 79, 99, 131, 3.8; 80, 4.1.1.1, 4.1.1.3). No evidence is presented to the effect that the objection is invalid.
	3.2.3.5 Information that is not true appears

3.2.3.5 Valse-informasie kom na vore in teenstrydige algemene stellings (Acta 2016:80, 4.1.1.1-4.1.1.3) sonder dat die beswaar teen die valse gesag van die meerderheidstem met duidelike bewysvoering weerlê word.	in contradictory, general statements, (Acta 2016:80, 4.1.1.1-4.1.1.3) without the objection against the false authority of the majority vote being contradicted on clear evidence.
3.2.3.6 Aan die een kant verdedig die Kommissie die meerderheidstem asof die kerke ooreengekom het dat die meerderheidstem gesag aan kerklike besluite verleen (Acta 2016:67, 78, 98, 130, 3.2) *"Die weg van KO, art 31 (meerderheid besluit) het onsself met mekaar vasgemaak"* (Acta 2016:68, 4.1.1). *"Sou die beswaardes hiermee* (met die meerderheidstem) *– 'n probleem hê, moet hulle die kerklike weg volg om ooreenkomstig KO, art 31 (waarop saam ooreengekom is) te wysig"* (Acta 2016:80, 4.1.1.1). *"Daar word beweer dat die Sinode die kerke deur sy besluit tot een standpunt dwing bloot op grond van 'n meerderheid van stemme. So 'n redenasie misken KO, art 31"* (Acta 2016:80, 4.1.1.2).	3.2.3.6 On the one hand the Commission defends the majority vote as if the churches had agreed on that the majority vote bestows authority upon ecclesiastic decisions (Acta 2016:67, 78, 98, 130, 3.2) *"The way of CO, art 31 (majority decision) is our arrangement with one another (Acta 2016:68, 4.1.1)".* *"Would the aggrieved have a problem with this (the majority vote), they must follow the churchly way according to CO, art 31 (which is agreed upon) in order to change it (Acta 2016:80, 4.1.1.1)".* *"There is claimed that the Synod forces the churches through its decision towards one point of view through a majority of votes. Such an argument denies CO, art 31 (Acta 2016:80, 4.1.1.2)".*
3.2.3.7 Aan die ander kant bevestig die Kommissie dat nie die meerderheidstem nie, maar die Skrif-, Belydenis- en Kerkorde-begronding gesag aan besluite verleen (Acta 2016:67, 79, 99, 131, 3.8; 80, 4.1.1.4). *"Wanneer 'n besluit met meerderheidstem geneem word op grond van Skrif, Belydenis en Kerkorde, word daar nie geheers nie (foutiewe interpretasie van KO, art 84), want dan regeer die Skrif"* (Acta 2016:80, 4.1.1.3). *"Besluite deur meerdere vergaderings word juis geneem op grond van Skrif, Belydenis en Kerkorde"* (Acta 2016:80, 4.1.1.4).	3.2.3.7 On the other hand, the Commission confirms that justification from Scripture, the Confession and the Church Order bestows authority on decisions, not the vote of the majority (Acta 2016:67, 79, 99, 131, 3.8; 80, 4.1.1.4). *"When a decision is taken by majority vote based upon Scripture, Confession and Church Order, is taken by majority-vote, there is no ruling (faulty interpretation of CO, art 84), because then Scripture rules. (Acta 2016:80, 4.1.1.3)"* *"Decisions by greater meetings is taken based upon Scripture, Confession and Church Order. (Acta 2016:80, 4.1.1.4)."*
3.2.3.8 Aangesien daar geen Skrif-, Belydenis- of Kerkorde-begronding vir die 2009-besluit gegee is nie en aangesien die 'Kommissie Kerkregtelik' geen sodanige gronde aandui nie, berus die 2009-besluit op die valse gesag van die meerderheidstem	3.2.3.8 As a result of the 2009-decision lacking foundation in Scripture, the Confession or the Church Order, and as a result of the 'Commission Church polity' not indicating any such foundation, the 2009-decision is based on the false authority of the majority vote (democracy) and

(demokrasie) en op die valse gesag van kollegialisme (Sinode).

3.2.3.9 Waar 'n verskil van mening oor 'n saak heers kan 'n paar stemme nie voorskryf wat vas en bindend is nie (Spoelstra 1989:193, 2). Die noodsaak vir die motivering van kerklike besluite word deur Spoelstra (1989:195-196, 5) uitgewys: "*Omdat die besluit van 'n kerklike vergadering deur sy kwaliteit en inherente waarde gedra moet word, moet dit op duidelike oorweginge of grond rus..."* en "*Meerdere vergaderings behoort geen saak sonder opgawe van rede te beslis nie*".

3.2.4 Bevinding : Motivering 2 – Beswaargrond 3

3.2.4.1 Die 2009-besluit is met meerderheid van stemme geneem. In Presbiteriale kerkregering verleen die meerderheidstem nie gesag aan besluite nie.

3.2.4.2 Geen Skrif-, Belydenis- of Kerkordebegronding is vir die 2009-besluit gegee nie en daarom word die valse gesag van die meerderheidstem in die besluit bedien.

3.2.4.3 Die besware teen die valse gesag van die meerderheidstem in die 2009-besluit word met informasie wat nie waar is nie en sonder enige geldige bewyse verkeerdelik deur die 2016-besluite afgewys.

3.2.4.4 'n Kerklike besluit wat die valse gesag van die meerderheidstem bedien kan en mag nie deur die as vas en bindend gehou word nie.

3.3 *Motivering 3 : Beswaargrond 3 – Valse gesag : KO, art 33*

Die besluit deur die afgevaardigdes van die GKSA in die Algemene Sinode in 2009 (Acta 2009:667, 4) bedien valse gesag in die lig van die Kerkorde omdat dit strydig is met die bepalings van KO, art 33.

Verskillende bepalings van KO, art 33 beïnvloed gesagvolle besluitneming

on the false authority of collegialism (Synod).

3.2.3.9 Where there is a difference of opinion about a matter, the majority of a few votes should not decide what is fixed and binding (Spoelstra 1989:193, 2). The necessity for justifying ecclesiastical decisions is pointed out by Spoelstra (1989:195-196, 5): "*Omdat die besluit van 'n kerklike vergadering deur sy kwaliteit en inherente waarde gedra moet word, moet dit op duidelike oorweginge of grond rus..."* and "*Meerdere vergaderings behoort geen saak sonder opgawe van rede te beslis nie*".

3.2.4 Conclusion : Justification 2 – Ground of Objection 3

3.2.4.1 The 2009-decision was taken by majority-vote. In Presbyterial church governance the majority vote does not bestow authority on any decision.

3.2.4.2 As no foundation from Scripture, the Confession or the Church Order is supplied for the 2009-decision, the false authority of the majority vote is administered by it.

3.2.4.3 The objections against the false authority of the majority vote in the 2009-decision, were wrongly repudiated by the 2016-decisions on the basis of information that is not true and without any valid evidence.

3.2.4.4 An ecclesiastical decision which administers the false authority of a majority of votes cannot and may not be held as fixed and binding by the GKSA.

3.3 *Justification 3 : Ground of Objection 3 – False authority : CO, art 33*

The decision by delegates of the GKSA in the General Synod in 2009 (Acta 2009:667, 4) administers false authority, because it is in conflict with the provisions of CO, art 33.

Several provisions of CO, art 33 influence authoritative decision-making by delegates in major assemblies.

deur afgevaardigdes in meerdere vergaderings.	
3.3.1 Afvaardiging : KO, art 33	3.3.1 Delegation : CO, art 33
3.3.1.1 Die plaaslike kerk is selfstandig en volledig kerk van Christus. In die lig van die Skrif (Hand 15:2, 22, 25; Spoelstra, 1989:205) kom meer kerke deur afvaardiging in meerderevergaderings saam. In meerdere vergaderings besluit die kerke deur afgevaardigdes oor sake wat nie op 'n mindere vergadering afgehandel kan word nie (KO, art 30).	3.3.1.1 The local church is an autonomous and complete church of Christ. In the light of Scripture (Acts 15:2, 22, 25; Spoelstra, 1989:205), churches meet in major assemblies by means of delegation. In major assemblies, churches take decisions through delegates about matters that could not be finalized by minor assemblies (CO, art 30).
3.3.1.2 Die gesag wat in kerklike besluite in 'n plaaslike kerk bedien word, is dieselfde gesag as dié wat deur besluite van die afgevaardigdes deur die kerke in meerdere vergaderings bedien word – dit is die gesag van Christus in gehoorsaamheid aan sy Woord.	3.3.1.2 The authority which is administered by ecclesiastical decisions in a local church, is the same authority administered by the decisions of delegates of the churches in major assemblies - is the authority of Christ in obedience to Scripture.
3.3.2 Kredensiebrief : KO, art 33	3.3.2 Letter of credence : CO, art 33
3.3.2.1 Kredensie- of geloofsbriewe dui aan wie afgevaardig is en wat die mandaat van die afgevaardigdes is. Die geloofsbrief gee aan die afgevaardigdes "...las en volmag..." om namens die kerk (plaaslike Kerkraad) of kerke (meer kerke in vergadering) wat stuur, besluite te neem. Hiermee word gesag nie aan die afgevaardigdes oorgedra of verleen nie. Die geloofsbrief dui aan dat die afgevaardigdes namens die kerk of kerke wat hulle stuur wettig gesagvolle besluite kan neem.	3.3.2.1 Credentials testify as to who are delegated and what the mandate of the delegates is. Credentials serve to define the mandate of delegates to take decisions on behalf of the church (local church council) or the churches (churches in a major assembly) that send them. Authority is not transferred or bestowed upon delegates. Their credentials indicate that delegates may lawfully take authoritative decisions on behalf of the church or churches that sent them.
3.3.2.2 Die mandaat van die afgevaardigdes word in die geloofsbrief aangedui. Hiermee word die bevoegdheid van die afgevaardigdes en die gesag van hulle besluite aangedui (Spoelstra, 1989:205). Die afgevaardigdes is gebonde (Van der Linde, 1983:136) om besluite in ooreenstemming met Skrif, Belydenis (Du Plooy, 1979:126) en Kerkorde te neem.	3.3.2.2 The mandate of delegates is contained in the letter of credence. In this letter the power of the delegates and the authority of their decisions are set out (Spoelstra, 1989:205). Delegates are obligated (Van der Linde, 1983:136) to take decisions in accordance with Scripture, the Confession (Du Plooy, 1979:126) and the Church Order.
3.3.2.3 Die geloofsbrief bepaal dat alle besluite "wat nie met die genoemde reël in stryd is nie" as vas en bindende aanvaar word. Besluite deur afgevaardigdes van kerke in meerdere vergaderings is bindend vir die kerke wat hulle stuur indien dit nie die mandaat in die geloofs-	3.3.2.3 Credentials stipulate that all decisions that are not in breach with the above rule are accepted as fixed and binding. Decisions by delegates of churches in major assemblies are fixed and binding with regards to the delegating churches, on condition that such decisions do not exceed the terms

brief oorskry nie.	of the mandate as set out in the letter of credence.
3.3.2.4 Voordat enige besluit deur afgevaardigdes van die in 'n meerdere vergadering geneem word, het die kerke ooreengekom dat:	3.3.2.4 By mutual consent, the churches have agreed, before any decision is taken in a major assemblies by the delegates of the GKSA, that the following will apply:
3.3.2.4.1 besluite wat in die lig van die Skrif, Belydenis en Kerkorde geneem word, as vas en bindend aanvaar word;	3.3.2.4.1 decisions taken in accordance with Scripture, the Confession and the Church Order, are accepted as fixed and binding;
3.3.2.4.2 besluite wat met die reël in stryd is – besluite wat nie in die lig van die Skrif, Belydenis en Kerkorde geneem word nie – nie as vas en bindend aanvaar word nie.	3.3.2.4.2 decisions in conflict with this rule, in other words, decisions that are not taken in accordance with Scripture, the Confession and the Church Order, are not accepted as fixed and binding.
3.3.3 <u>Keurstem : KO, art 33</u>	3.3.3 <u>Adjudicative Vote : CO, art 33</u>
3.3.3.1 Elke afgevaardigde na 'n meerdere vergadering ontvang 'n keurstem. Keurstem gee aan afgevaardigdes die verantwoordelikheid om sake by wyse van stemming te keur. Keuring hou in dat 'n saak geweeg, beoordeel en getoets word teen 'n vaste maatstaf (Spoelstra, 1989:205). Die maatstaf waarteen 'n saak geweeg word, word in die geloofsbrief aangedui as die Skrif, Belydenis en Kerkorde.	3.3.3.1 Each delegate to a major assembly receives an adjudicative vote. An adjudicative vote imposes upon a delegate the responsibility to adjudicate matters by means of voting. Adjudication includes that a matter be weighed, judged and tested against a standard or bench mark (Spoelstra, 1989:205). The bench mark against which matters are to be measured, is indicated in a delegate's credentials: Scripture, the Confession and the Church Order.
3.3.3.2 Om die mandaat wat in die geloofsbrief en keurstem aan afgevaardigdes gegee word na te kom moet geldige gronde vir besluite in die lig van die Skrif, Belydenis of Kerkorde aangewys word.	3.3.3.2 In order to comply with the mandate and the adjudicative vote granted by a delegate's credentials, valid grounds derived from Scripture, the Confession and the Church Order have to be shown for decisions.
3.3.3.3 Besluite wat in ooreenstemming met die Skrif, Belydenis en Kerkorde geneem is, bedien die gesag van Christus tot opbou van die kerk en uitbreiding van die Koninkryk. Die Skrifgronde vir 'n kerklike besluit moet nie net in die bespreking na vore te kom nie, maar saam met die besluite genotuleer te word (KO, art 34).	3.3.3.3 Decisions taken in accordance with Scripture, the Confession and the Church Order administer the authority of Christ for the edification of the church and the expansion of God's Kingdom. Scriptural grounds for a decision have not only to be heard in discussion, but should be recorded together with the decision (CO, art 34).
3.3.4 <u>2009-besluit : KO, art 33</u>	3.3.4 <u>2009 decision : CO, art 33</u>
3.3.4.1 Die besluit deur afgevaardigdes van die GKSA in die Algemene Sinode in 2009 (Acta 2009:667, 4) is nie vas	3.3.4.1 The decision by delegates of the GKSA in the General Synod in 2009 (Acta 2009:667, 4) is neither fixed nor binding on the churches

en bindend vir die kerke nie omdat die afgevaardigdes in die besluit buite hulle mandaat, soos onderling afgespreek (KO, art 33), opgetree het.	because the delegates exceeded their mutually agreed mandate (CO, art 33) in taking the decision.
3.3.4.2 Geen motivering en geen SKRIF-begronding (KO, art 33) is deur die afgevaardigdes vir die 2009-besluit gegee nie.	3.3.4.2 No justification or Scriptural foundation is supplied by the delegates for the 2009-decision.
3.3.4.3 Geen motivering en geen BELYDENIS-begronding (KO, art 33) is deur die afgevaardigdes vir die 2009-besluit gegee nie.	3.3.4.3 No justification or Confessional foundation is supplied by the delegates for the 2009-decision.
3.3.4.4 Geen motivering en geen KERK-ORDE-begronding (KO, art 33) is deur die afgevaardigdes vir die 2009-besluit gegee nie.	3.3.4.4 No justification or foundation derived from the Church Order is supplied by the delegates for the 2009-decision.
3.3.5 <u>Bevinding : Motivering 3 – Beswaar-grond 3</u>	3.3.5 <u>Conclusion : Justification 3 – Ground of Objection 3</u>
3.3.5.1 Die kerke het vooraf ooreengekom (KO, art 33) dat besluite, wat deur afgevaardigdes van kerke in meerdere vergadering in die lig van die Skrif, Belydenis en Kerkorde geneem word, vas en bindend is.	3.3.5.1 Beforehand, the churches mutually agreed (CO art 33) that decisions by delegates of the churches assembled in major assemblies, taken on the basis of Scripture, the Confession and the Church Order, are fixed and binding.
3.3.5.2 Omdat die nodige Skrif-, Belydenis- en Kerkorde-begronding vir die besluit ontbreek, is die 2009-besluit in stryd met KO, art 33. Daarom is die besluit, soos vooraf ooreengekom (KO, art 33), nie vas en bindend vir die kerke nie.	3.3.5.2 Because the 2009-decision lacks foundation in Scripture, the Confession or the Church Order, it is in conflict with CO, art 33. Consequently the decision is not fixed or binding on the churches.
3.4 *Bevinding : Beswaargrond 3*	3.4 *Conclusion : Ground of Objection 3*
3.4.1 Motiverings 1, 2 en 3 van beswaar-grond 3 en hulle bevindings bevestig dat die besluit deur die afge-vaardigdes van die GKSA in die Algemene Sinode in 2009 (Acta 2009:667, 4) valse gesag in die lig van die Presbiteriale kerkregering en die Kerkorde bedien.	3.4.1 Justifications 1, 2 and 3 for ground of objection 3, together with their conclusions, confirm that the decision by the delegates of the GKSA in the General Synod in (Acta 2009:667, 4) administer false authority in light of Presbyterial church governance and the Church Order.
3.4.2 Die valse gesag van kollegialisme en die valse gesag van die meerder-heidstem word in die 2009-besluit bedien.	3.4.2 The false authority of collegialism and the false authority of the majority-vote is administered by the 2009-decision.
3.4.3 Die 2009-besluit bedien ook valse gesag omdat die besluit in stryd is met die bepalings van KO, art 33 vir vas en bindende besluite.	3.4.3 The 2009-decision also administers false authority due to the decision contradicting. the provisions of CO, art 33 with regards to fixed and binding decisions.
3.4.4 Kerklike besluite wat valse gesag in die lig van die Presbiteriale kerk-regering en die Kerkorde bedien, kan	3.4.4 Ecclesiastical decisions that administer false authority in light of presbyterial church government and

en mag nie deur die kerke as vas en bindend aanvaar word nie. Omdat die 2009-besluit hieraan skuldig is kan die besluit nie deur die kerke as vas en bindend gehou word nie.

4. Beswaargrond 4 – Valse gesag : 2016-besluite

Die besluit deur die afgevaardigdes van die GKSA in die Algemene Sinode in 2009 (Acta 2009:667, 4) wat valse gesag bedien, word met valse gesag deur die 2016-besluite verdedig en met valse gesag op die kerke afgedwing.

4.1 *Motivering 1 : Beswaargrond 4 – Onwaar-informasie : 'Kommissie Kerkregtelik'*

'n Kenmerk van die wêreld waarin ons lewe is informasie wat nie waar is nie. Deur valse inligting te versprei word die leuen gedien en nie die waarheid nie. Informasie wat nie waar is nie het ook na vore gekom in die Rapporte van die 'Kommissie Kerkregtelik' by die Buitengewone Algemene Sinode 2016. Op grond van die informasie wat nie waar is nie, is daar besluite geneem en besware verkeerdelik afgewys.

4.1.1 <u>Onwaar-informasie : Opdrag</u>

4.1.1.1 Die opdrag aan die 'Kommissie Kerkregtelik' is om al die ter sake kerkregtelike beginsels uit die verskillende Beswaarskrifte aan te wys en in die konteks van elke afsonderlike Beswaarskrif toe te pas (Acta 2016:66, C.1; 78, K. 1; 97, I. 1; 130, E. 1).

4.1.1.2 Die Kommissie maak dieselfde algemene opmerkings en stellings oor 4 (vier) afsonderlike Beswaarskrifte (Acta 2016:66-68; 78-80; 98-99; 130-132, 3) onder die opskrif '*Kerkregtelike beginsels ter sprake'*. Die opskrif skep die indruk dat die opdrag uitgevoer is en dat die Rapport ter sake kerkregtelike beginsels uit die Beswaarskrifte aanwys. Die indruk kom neer op informasie wat nie waar is nie want die opdrag is nie uitgevoer nie en geen kerkregtelike beginsels word

the Church Order, cannot and may not be accepted as fixed and binding. As false authority applies to the 2009-decision in all respects, it cannot be accepted by the churches as fixed and binding.

4. Ground of Objection 4 – False authority : 2016-Decisions

The decision by delegates from the GKSA, in the General Synod in 2009 (Acta 2009:667, 4) that administers false authority, is defended by false authority in the 2016-decisions and this is forced upon the churches with the false authority.

4.1 *Justification 1 : Ground of Objection 4 – Untrue information : 'Commission Church polity'*

The world we live in is characterized by information that is not true. By spreading information that is not true, falsehood is served and not the truth. Information that is not true occurs in the reports of the 'Commission Church polity' during the Extraordinary General Synod 2016. Decisions were taken and petitions rejected on account of information that is not true.

4.1.1 <u>Untrue Information : Assignment</u>

4.1.1.1 The assignment given to the 'Commission Church polity' was to show all the church polity principles that were addressed in the different petitions of protest and to apply these principles in the context of each separate petition (Acta 2016:66, C.1; 78, K. 1; 97, I. 1; 130, E. 1).

4.1.1.2 The Commission repeats the same general comments and statements aimed at 4 (four) distinctive Petitions of protest (Acta 2016:66-68; 78-80; 98-99; 130-132, 3), under the heading "*Church polity principles on the table.*" The heading suggests that the assignment had been carried out and that the report points out the relevant church polity principles emanating from the Petitions of protest. This impression boils down to information that is not true, as the assignment was not carried out

deur die Kommissie uitgewys nie. In al 4 (vier) Rapporte van die Kommissie oor die Beswaarskrifte word daar een keer na die beginsel van KO, art 31 verwys (Acta 2016:67; 79; 98; 130, 3.5). Wat die beginsel is word nie uitgewys nie.	and no church polity principles were pointed out. In all 4 (four) reports of the Commission concerning the Petitions of protest, there is one reference to the principle of CO, art 31 (Acta 2016:67; 79; 98; 130, 3.5). What the particular principle entails is not disclosed.
4.1.1.3 Die verwysing na kerkregtelike beginsels in die opdrag aan en in die Rapport van die 'Kommissie Kerkregtelik' sonder dat die beginsels aangewys word, kom neer op informasie wat nie waar is nie. Met informasie wat nie waar is nie, is die indruk geskep dat die besware in die lig van kerkregtelike beginsels beoordeel is. In die lig van informasie wat nie waar is nie is besluite geneem waardeur besware verkeerdelik afgewys is.	4.1.1.3 References to church polity principles in the assignment as well as in the Report of the 'Commission Church polity' without those principles being pointed, out boils down to information that is not true. With information that is not true the impression is created that the petitions of protest were judged in the light of church polity principles. Information that is not true also led to objections being wrongfully overruled.
4.1.2 <u>Onwaar-informasie : Algemene opmerkings</u>	4.1.2 <u>Untrue Information : General Comments</u>
4.1.2.1 Die 'Kommissie Kerkregtelik' maak algemene opmerkings in 'n Rapport wat 4 (vier) keer aan die afgevaardigdes deur die GKSA na die Buitengewone Algemene Sinode in 2016 voorgelê word (Acta 2016:66-68, C 3; 78-80, K 3; 97-99, I 3; 130-132, E 3). Informasie wat nie waar is nie kom in die Rapport na vore.	4.1.2.1 The 'Commission Church polity' comments in general terms in its report. The Report is submitted no less than 4 (four) times to delegates of the GKSA in the Extraordinary General Synod in 2016 (Acta 2016:66-68, C 3; 78-80, K 3; 97-99, I 3; 130-132, E 3). Information that is not true is represented in this Report.
4.1.2.2 Die beswaar dat die Sinode nie in gehoorsaamheid aan die Skrif 'n keuse tussen die twee opsies kon maak nie, word deur die Kommissie in 'n opmerking afgemaak as vals – 'n opmerking wat in sigself onwaar is (Acta 2016:66-67; 78; 98; 130, 3.2). Die waarheid is dat daar geen Skrifgronde vir die keuse gegee is nie. Beide die Kommissie en die 2016-besluite bly in gebreke om Skrifgronde in en vir die 2009-besluit aan te dui.	4.1.2.2 The protest, that the Synod in 2009 could not have made a choice between the two options in obedience to Scripture, is rejected by the Commission as false – a claim that is invalid ((Acta 2016:66-67; 78; 98; 130, 3.2). The rejection is untrue. The truth is that no Scriptural grounds for the choice were disclosed. The Commission and the 2016-decisions fail to indicate any Scriptural grounds in and for the 2009 decision.
4.1.2.3 Die stelling dat die Sinode onder leiding van die Gees die korrekte keuse gemaak het, kom neer op informasie wat nie waar is nie (Acta 2016:66-67; 78; 98; 130, 3.2). Indien die stelling waar is, sou dit beteken dat alle besluite wat deur afgevaar-	4.1.2.3 The statement that Synod made the correct choice under the guidance of the Holy Spirit boils down to information that is not true (Acta 2016:66-67; 78; 98; 130, 3.2). If this statement were to be correct, it would imply that all decisions taken by delegates of

	digdes van die GKSA in Sinodes geneem word, korrek is, want die besluite is onder leiding van die die Heilige Gees geneem. Talle Beswaarskrifte en Appèlle oor die jare bevestig dat dit nie waar is nie – baie verkeerde besluite is oor jare heen geneem.		GKSA in major assemblies are correct, as such decisions are taken under the guidance of the Holy Spirit. Numerous Petitions of protest and appeals over the years testify to the fact that this is not true – many wrong decisions have been made in the past.
4.1.2.4	Verkeerde kerklike besluite, besluite wat valse gesag bedien kan nie aan die leiding van die Heilige Gees, die Gees van waarheid (Joh 14:17) toegeskryf word nie. Hoekom die Gees verkeerde besluite in die kerk toelaat, is moeilik te beantwoord, maar dit gebeur.	4.1.2.4	Incorrect ecclesiastic decisions, decisions that administer false authority, cannot be ascribed to the guidance of the Holy Spirit, the Spirit of Truth (Joh 14:17). It is difficult to explain why the Holy Spirit allows incorrect decisions in the church, but it happens.
4.1.2.5	Die aanspraak dat die leiding van die Gees sou beteken dat die 2009-besluit die korrekte besluit is, is nie die volle waarheid nie. 'n Halwe waarheid kom neer op 'n onwaarheid. Die Kommissie verswyg 'n belangrike waarheid ten opsigte van die kerklike besluitnemingsproses. Die afgevaardigdes van die GKSA wat besluite in meerdere vergaderings neem is een en almal feilbare sondaarmense. Verkeerde besluite word geneem want mense is betrokke in die besluitnemingsproses. *"Alle mense is immers uit hulleself leuenaars en nietiger as die nietigheid self (Ps 62:10)"* (NGB, art 7). Omdat feilbare mense die 2009-besluit geneem het, kan daar nie – soos die Kommissie beweer – aanspraak gemaak word dat die korrekte besluit onder leiding van die Gees geneem is nie.	4.1.2.5	The claim that the guidance by the Holy Spirit implies that the 2009-decision was the correct decision, is not the full truth of the matter. A half truth is in fact an untruth. The Commission remains silent about an important truth in ecclesiastic decision-making. The delegates of the GKSA taking decisions in major assemblies are one and all fallible, sinful human beings. Incorrect decisions are made due to human beings being involved in the decision-making process. "*For all human beings are liars by nature and more vain than vanity itself* (Ps 62:10)" (BC, Art 7). Due to fallible human beings being involved in the 2009-decision, the claim cannot be made, as the Commission did, that the correct decision was made under the guidance of the Holy Spirit.
4.1.2.6	Die feilbaarheid van sondaarmense maak dit soveel meer noodsaaklik dat geldige begronding in die lig van die Skrif, Belydenis en Kerkorde vir kerklike besluite gegee word. Kerklike besluite wat duidelik Skrifgegrond is, kan voorgehou word as besluite waarvan gesê kan word: 'die Heilige Gees en ons het besluit' (Hand 15:15-18, 28; Du Plooy 1979:94). Sonder enige Skrifbegronding kan die aanspraak, dat 'n korrekte besluit onder leiding van die Gees geneem is, moeilik aanvaar word. Omdat daar geen	4.1.2.6	The very fallibility of sinful human beings necessitates valid ecclesiastic decisions being founded on Scripture, the Confession and the Church Order. Ecclesiastic decisions clearly founded on Scripture can be presented as decisions of which it can be said: 'the Holy Spirit and we have decided' (Acts 15:28; Du Plooy 1979:94) In the absence of any Scriptural foundation, it is most difficult to accept the claim that the correct decision was made under the guidance of the Holy Spirit. Due to the lack of Scriptural

	Skrifbegronding in en vir die 2009-besluit gegee is nie, kan die betoog van die 'Kommissie Kerkregtelik', dat die korrekte besluit onder leiding van die Gees geneem is, nie as waar aanvaar word nie.		foundation for the 2009-decision, the claim by the 'Commission Church polity' – that the correct decision was taken under the guidance of the Holy spirit, cannot be accepted as true.
4.1.2.7	Die bewering deur die Kommissie (Acta 2016:67, 79, 98, 131, 3.6) dat sommige beswaardes bewyse van die Sinode vra om die 'status quo' te handhaaf kom neer op informasie wat nie waar is nie. Die Kommissie gebruik die begrip 'status quo' (Acta 2016:67, 79, 98, 131, 3.6). Geeneen van die Beswaarskrifte gebruik die begrip nie.	4.1.2.7	The allegation by the Commission (Acta 2016:67, 79, 98, 131, 3.6) that some of the aggrieved petitioners require proof from Synod to maintain the 'status quo', boils down to information that is not true. The Commission employs the concept "status quo" (Acta 2016:67, 79, 98, 131, 3.6). None of the Petitioners use the concept.
4.1.2.8	Die bewering deur die Kommissie (Acta 2016:69, 4.3.1.3; 70, 4.4.1.2; 100, 4.1.2.2 en 4.1.2.4; 133, 4.2.6.1 en 4.2.8.1) dat besluitneming in die saak daaroor gaan om die 'status quo' te handhaaf kom neer op informasie wat nie waar is nie. Besluitneming deur die afgevaardigdes van die GKSA in die Algemene Sinode in 2009 oor die saak van die vrou in besondere dienste gaan nie daaroor om die 'status quo' te handhaaf of nie. Die 2009-besluit word geneem in die lig van 'n opdrag wat deur die afgevaardigdes van die GKSA in die Algemene Sinode 2009 aan 'n Kommissie gegee is. Die Kommissie het by die voortsetting van die Sinode oor die saak gerapporteer (Acta 2009:582, 3). In die opdrag aan die Kommissie en in hulle Rapport is nie sprake daarvan om die 'status quo' te handhaaf nie. Besluitneming in die saak om bloot die 'status quo' te handhaaf word afgewys omdat dit die indruk sal skep dat daar bloot aan tradisies vasgehou word (Acta 2009:667, 3.3).	4.1.2.8	The assertion by the Commission (Acta 2016:69, 4.3.1.3; 70, 4.4.1.2; 100, 4.1.2.2 and 4.1.2.4; 133, 4.2.6.1 en 4.2.8.1), that decision in the matter was sought in order to maintain the 'status quo', boils down to information that is not true. Deciding over the matter of women serving in the particular services by delegates of the GKSA in the General Synod in 2009, did not involve maintaining the 'status quo.' The 2009-decision was taken in pursuance of an assignment given to a Commission by the delegates from the GKSA in the General Synod 2009. This Commission reported back when the Synod continued (Acta 2009:582, 3). Neither in the assignment to the Commission, nor in their Report is there any mention of maintaining the 'status quo'. A decision to merely maintain the 'status quo' is rejected as it would give the impression that traditions were merely being adhered to (Acta 2009:667, 3.3).
4.1.2.9	Van die opmerkings van die 'Kommissie Kerkregtelik' oor besluite en KO, art 31 kom neer op informasie wat nie waar is nie. Die gebruik van KO, art 31 om die gesag van besluite deur 'n Sinode te bekragtig (Acta 2016:68; 80; 99; 131, 3.13 en 3.14), kom neer op 'n halwe waarheid. 'n Halwe waarheid	4.1.2.9	Some of the comments of the 'Commission Church polity' concerning decisions and CO, art 31, boil down to information that is not true. The employment of CO, art 31 to confirm the authority of decisions by a Synod (Acta 2016:68; 80; 99; 131, 3.13 and 3.14) is a half-truth. A half-truth constitutes a falsehood. The very

is ‘n onwaarheid. Die doel van KO, art 31 is om kerklike besluite wat die reg krenk by wyse van Appèl nietig te verklaar. Die artikel gee nie gesag aan kerklike besluite nie, maar beskerm die gesag van die besluite. Die Skrif gee gesag aan besluite. Daarom moet duidelike bewyse in die lig van die Skrif, Belydenis en Kerkorde gegee word om ‘n besluit nietig te verklaar.	purpose of CO, art 31 is to declare unjust church decisions, null and void by means of appeal proceedings. This article does not bestow authority on ecclesiastical decisions, but it protects the authority of the decisions. Scripture gives authority to decisions. For that very reason, clear evidence from Scripture, the Confession or the Church Order has to be put forward in order to declare a decision null and void.
4.1.2.10 Die Kommissie wys tereg daarop dat beswaardes in die lig van KO, art 31 bewyse in die lig van die Skrif, Belydenis en Kerkorde moet gee om die verandering van ‘n besluit te motiveer (Acta 2016:68, 79-80, 99, 131, 3.12 en 3.13; 100, 4.1.2.3; 133, 4.2.5.1). **MAAR** die bewering dat, in die lig van KO, art 31 dit nie vir ‘n meerdere vergadering nodig is om sodanige bewys te lewer nie (Acta 2016:68; 80; 99; 131, 3.13; 100, 4.1.2.3; 133, 4.2.5.1) is nie waar nie.	4.1.2.10 The Commission justifiably indicates that aggrieved parties have to provide evidence from Scripture, the Confession or the Church Order, to justify an amendment to an ecclesiastic decision (Acta 2016:68, 79-80, 99, 131, 3.12 en 3.13; 100, 4.1.2.3; 133, 4.2.5.1). **HOWEVER**, the observation that, pursuant to CO, art 31, major assemblies need not render such evidence (Acta 2016:68; 80; 99; 131, 3.13; 100, 4.1.2.3; 133, 4.2.5.1), is not true.
4.1.2.11 Bewyslewering (KO, art 31) in die lig van die Skrif, Belydenis en Kerkorde om ‘n besluit te verander veronderstel dat die besluit, wat gewysig staan te word, in die lig van die Skrif, Belydenis en Kerkorde geneem is. KO, art 31 kan nie los van die ander artikels van die Kerkorde toegepas word nie. Die bepalings in KO, art 31 veronderstel dat kerklike sake op ‘n kerklike wyse (KO, art 30) hanteer word. Die kerklike wyse waarop sake hanteer word, word onder andere in KO, art 33 gereël. Kerke vaardig af na meerdere vergaderings. Kerke gee aan afgevaardigdes na meerdere vergaderings die volmag (KO, art 33) om oor alle sake in die lig van die Skrif, Belydenis en Kerkorde te oordeel en te besluit. Alleen besluite, wat nie met die mandaat – soos die geloofsbrief aangedui – in stryd is nie, word deur die kerke as vas en bindend aanvaar.	4.1.2.11 The submission of evidence (CO art 31) from Scripture, the Confession and the Church Order to alter a church decision, presupposes that the decision was taken in the light of Scripture, the Confession and the Church Order. CO, art 31 cannot be applied in isolation from the rest of the provisions of the Church Order. The stipulations of CO, art 31 presuppose that church matters are handled in an ecclesiastic manner (CO, art 30). The ecclesiastic manner in which matters should be handled is regulated inter alia in CO, art 33. Churches send delegates to major assemblies. Church delegates receive power of attorney (CO, art 33) to judge and decide in obedience to Scripture, the Confession and the Church Order, in alle matters before the major assembly. As the letter of credence indicates, only decisions which do not contradict

			the mandate, are considered by the churches to be fixed and binding.
4.1.2.12	Besluite deur afgevaardigdes van die GKSA na meerdere vergaderings, wat in Skrifbegrond en gemotiveer is, is vas en bindend vir die kerke. Daarom kan en moet kerke vra vir grondige motivering van alle kerklike besluite in die lig van die Skrif, Belydenis en Kerkorde. Die bewering deur die Kommissie dat meerdere vergaderings nie Skrifmotivering vir besluite moet aandui nie, is nie waar nie maar vals (KO, art 33). Afgevaardigdes deur die GKSA na meerdere vergaderings moet erns maak dat daar geldige gronde in die lig van die Skrif, Belydenis en Kerkorde vir besluite gegee word. Indien sodanige begronding/ motivering ontbreek, bedien die besluite valse gesag.	4.1.2.12	Decisions which are duly founded on Scripture, the Confession and the Church Order, and are taken by delegates of the GKSA in major assemblies, are fixed and binding for the churches. That is why churches may and should require sound justification in the light of Scripture, the Confession and the Church Order, for all ecclesiastical decisions. The observation by the Commission that major assemblies do not have to render Scriptural justification for their decisions, is false (CO, art 33). Delegates sent to major assemblies by the GKSA must ensure that valid justify-cation from Scripture, the Confession and the Church Order be supplied for decisions. In the event of such decisions lacking the said justification, the decisions administer false authority.
4.1.2.13	Die bewering deur die 'Kommissie Kerkregtelik' dat die afgevaardigdes van die Gereformeerde Kerke na die Algemene Sinode 2015 besluit het dat die saak rondom die vrou 'n wesentlike saak is (Acta 2016, 68; 80; 99; 131, 3/14), kom neer op informasie wat nie waar is nie. Dit is opvallend en veelseggend dat geen verwysing na die besluit gegee word nie. Die Notule en die Handelinge (Acta 2015) gee geen besluit waarin gesê word dat die saak van die vrou in die besondere dienste, 'n wesentlike saak is nie. Bewyslewering hieroor word in 'n Beskrywingspunt vanaf Streeksinode Randvaal by die Algemene Sinode 2018 gemaak.	4.1.2.13	The allegation by the 'Commission: church polity' that delegates from the Reformed Churches to the General Synod 2015 decided that the matter surrounding women constituted an essential matter, (Acta 2016, 68; 80; 99; 131, 3/14), boils down to information that is not true. The lack of any reference to the so-called decision is both conspicuous and significant. Neither the Minutes, nor the Acts (Acta 2015) supply a decision that the matter of women in the particular offices constitutes an essential matter. A full discussion of this issue is set out in a Point of description submitted by Regional Synod Randvaal to the General Synod 2018.
4.1.2.14	Jare se Skrifstudie oor die saak van die vrou in die besondere dienste in die GKSA het verskillende geloofwaardige en houdbare eksegese van verskillende Skrifgedeeltes opgelewer (Acta	4.1.2.14	Extensive studies of Scripture concerning the matter of women in the particular offices in the GKSA rendered several valid and acceptable exegeses of a range of texts from Scripture (Acta 2009:611-664, 10). Two

2009:611-664, 10). Twee teenoorgestelde aanvaarbare opsies het in die lig van die Skrif hieruit voortgespruit (Acta 2009:664, 10.15; 667, 4). Die twee teenoorgestelde opsies bevestig dat die saak nie wesentlik is nie. Die Skrif laat ruimte vir verskille. In die lig van die Skrif kan een dag vir 'n gelowige belangriker wees as ander dae en in die lig van die Skrif kan al die dae vir 'n ander gelowige ewe belangrik wees (Rom 14:5). Sake waarin die Skrif ruimte laat vir verskille, is nie-wesentlike sake. Die twee verskillende teenoorgestelde opsies ten opsigte van vroue in die besondere dienste, wat beide op geldige en aanvaarbare Skrifverklaring berus, bevestig dat die geslag van die bedienaar in die besondere dienste, nie 'n wesentlik saak is nie.

4.2 *Motivering 2 : Beswaargrond 4 – Onwaar-informasie : Beoordeling van besware*

Informasie wat nie waar is nie en wat by die Buitengewone Algemene Sinode in 2016 na vore kom in die beoordeling van beswaargronde lei tot besluite waardeur besware verkeerdelik afgewys is.

4.2.1 <u>Besluit : Beswaarskrif van die GK Bloemfontein-Suid (Acta 2016:50-61)</u>

4.2.1.1 Die volgende bevinding word gemaak oor beswaargrond 3 van die GK Bloemfontein-Suid (Acta 2016:59, 2.10): *"Die Skrifverklaring waarop die besluit van 2009 rus het duidelik Skrifgronde en verreken die reëls van Skrifverklaring deeglik en konsekwent".*

4.2.1.2 Hierdie bevinding is nie waar nie. Hier word valslike beweer dat die 2009-besluit op duidelik Skrifgronde en Skrifverklaring berus. Wat die Skrifgronde is word nie aangedui nie en dit kan ook nie aangedui word nie. Geen Skrifmotivering is vir die 2009-besluit, wat die NEE-opsie

acceptable opposing viewpoints based on Scripture arose from this study (Acta 2009:664, 10.15; 667, 4). It is submitted that the two resulting viewpoints confirm that the matter is non-essential. Scripture allows for differences. In the light of Scripture, one day may be of greater importance to a believer than other days, as also in the light of Scripture, all days may be equally important to another believer (Rom 14:5). Matters, in which Scripture allows room for differences, are non-essential matters. The two different opposing options concerning women in the particular offices, equally founded in valid and acceptable exegesis of Scripture, serve to confirm that the gender of the servant in the particular offices is non-essential.

4.2 *Justification 2: Ground of Objection 4 – Untrue Information : Adjudication of protests*

Information that is not true, which was brought to bear on the adjudication of grounds of objection at the Extra-ordinary General Synod in 2016 resulted in decisions that wrongly rejected these objections.

4.2.1 <u>Resolution : Petition of protest by the GK Bloemfontein-Suid (Acta 2016:50-61)</u>

4.2.1.1 The following conclusion is reached concerning ground of objection 3 of the GK Bloemfontein-Suid (Acta 2016:59, 2.10): *"The exposition upon which the decision of 2009 is based, has clear Scriptural foundation and takes the rules of Scriptural exposition into account in a thorough and consistent manner"*

4.2.1.2 This conclusion boils down to information that is not true. It is alleged here that the 2009-decision is based on clear Scriptural grounds and exposition. Whatever the grounds are, they are not indicated and cannot be indicated. No justification from Scripture is supplied for the 2009-

gekies het, gegee nie. Van al die Skrifgetuienis wat in die Rapport na vore kom (Acta 2009:611-664, 10), word kennis geneem (Acta 2009:665, 12.10.1). 'Kennis neem' beteken dat die afgevaardigdes van die GKSA in die Algemene Sinode in 2009 nie die Skrifgetuienis in die Rapport vir hulle rekening neem nie. Omdat daar slegs kennis geneem is van die verskillende teenoorgestelde geloofwaardige en houdbare eksegese van verskillende Skrifgedeeltes in die Rapport, gee dit nie en kan dit nie Skrifmotivering vir die 2009-besluit gee nie.	decision to choose the NO-option. All the Scriptural evidence which appeared in the Report (Acta 2009:611-664, 10), is duly noted (Acta 2009:665, 12.10.1). Having merely noted that evidence means that the delegates of the GKSA in the General Synod in 2009 did not accept the Scriptural evidence for their own account. Because the different valid and acceptable exegeses of several texts from Scripture in the Report were merely noted, no Scriptural justification for the decision arises or can arise from it.
4.2.1.3 In die lig van die bevinding wat valslik die indruk skep dat die 2009-besluit op duidelike Skrifgronde berus word verkeerdelik besluit dat beswaargrond 3 nie slaag nie (Acta 2016:59, 2.11).	4.2.1.3 In the light of the conclusion which falsely creates the impression that the 2009-decision is based on clear Scriptural grounds, it is wrongly decided that ground of objection 3 does not succeed (Acta 2016:59, 2.11).
4.2.2 <u>Besluite : Beswaarskrif van die GK Klerksdorp (Acta 2016:62-70)</u>	4.2.2 <u>Decisions : Petition of protest of GK Klerksdorp (Acta 2016:62-70)</u>
4.2.2.1 Die beswaar (Acta 2016:63, 3.1) dat die 2009-besluit nie in gehoorsaamheid aan die Skrif geneem is nie, word afgemaak as ongeldig – 'n beoordeling wat self nie waar is nie (Acta 2016:68, 4.1).	4.2.2.1 The objection (Acta 2016:63, 3.1) that the 2009-decision was not taken in obedience to Scripture is rejected on the basis that it is false. This rejection is invalid (Acta 2016:68, 4.1).
4.2.2.2 Die stelling dat die 2009-besluit op die Skrifgegewens in die Rapport gegrond is, is nie waar nie (Acta 2016:69, 4.2.1.1). Van al die Skrifgetuienis wat in die Rapport na vore kom (Acta 2009:611-664, 10) – word kennis geneem (Acta 2009:665, 12.10.1). Die 'Kommissie Kerkregtelik' bevestig self dat die informasie nie waar is nie deur daarop te wys dat deur kennis te neem die vergadering die inhoud van die Rapport nie vir sy rekening neem nie (Acta 2016:67, 3.8). Omdat daar slegs kennis geneem is van die verskillende teenoorgestelde geloofwaardige en houdbare eksegese van verskillende Skrifgedeeltes in die Rapport, gee dit nie en kan dit nie Skrifmotivering vir die 2009-besluit gee nie.	4.2.2.2 The statement that the 2009-decision is based on the Scriptural material in the report is not true. Of all the Scriptural material in the Report (Acta 2009:611-664, 10), mere notice is taken (Acta 2009:665, 12.10.1). The 'Commission Church polity' itself confirms this information is not true by pointing out that by merely taking note, the assembly does not adopt the Report for its own account (Acta 2016:67, 3.8). Because the different valid and acceptable exegeses of various Scriptural texts in the report, were merely noted, that material cannot serve as Scriptural justification for the 2009-decision.
4.2.2.3 In die lig van informasie wat nie waar is nie word valslik die indruk	4.2.2.3 In the light of information that is not true the false impression is created that the 2009-decision is based on

	geskep dat daar Skrifgronde vir die 2009-besluit is. In die lig hiervan word verkeerdelik aanbeveel en besluit dat hierdie beswaargrond nie slaag nie (Acta 2016:69, 4.2.2.1).		Scriptural grounds. Pursuing this false impression, it is wrongly decided that this ground of objection does not succeed (Acta 2016:69, 4.2.2.1).
4.2.2.4	Die beswaar (Acta 2016:64-65, 3), dat die 2009-besluit sonder enige Skrifmotivering vir een van twee opsies wat in lig van die Skrif moontlik is kies, word met informasie wat nie waar is nie afgewys.	4.2.2.4	The objection (Acta 2016:64-65, 3) that the 2009-decision chooses between two options, both of which are possible in the light of Scripture, is rejected on the basis of information that is not true.
4.2.2.5	Die Kommissie bevraagteken die twee opsies en twee Skrif-interpretasies waartussen die afgevaardigdes in die 2009-besluit moes kies (Acta 2016:69, 4.3.1.1). Volgens die Kommissie is daar net EEN en daarvoor is gekies. Die Kommissie se weergawe van die 2009-besluit is nie waar nie. In die Rapport (Acta 2009:664, 10.15) en in die aanbeveling van die Advieskommissie (Acta 2009:667, 4.2) is daar twee opsies gegrond op twee aanvaarbare Skrif-interpretasies. Die 2009-besluit beteken volgens die Kommissie dat een interpretasie as korrek aanvaar en die ander een as verkeerd afgewys is. Die afleiding, waarvoor geen motivering gegee is nie, is vals. Die 2009-besluit beteken nie dat al die Skrifgetuienis wat die NEE-opsie ondersteun as korrek aanvaar en dat al die Skrifgetuienis wat die JA-opsie ondersteun as foutief verwerp is nie. Oor al die Skrifgetuienis vir die JA- en NEE-opsies is reeds besluit: KENNIS GENEEM (Acta 2009:665, 12.10.1). Om ‘n keuse te maak tussen twee verskillende teenoorgestelde opsies wat op geloofwaardige en houdbare eksegese berus sou beteken dat daar genoegsame Skrifgetuienis is om vir een van die twee opsies te kies. Sodanige Skrifgetuienis bestaan nie en is nie in 2009 voorgelê vir oorweging in die besluitneming nie.	4.2.2.5	The Commission questions the two options and the two Scriptural expositions between which the delegates had to choose in the 2009-decision (Acta 2016:69, 4.3.1.1). According to the Commission there is only ONE option and that was chosen. The Commission’s version of the 2009-decision is not truthful. In the Report (Acta 2009:664, 10.15) and in the recommendation of the Advisory Commission (Acta 2009:667, 4.2) there are two options; a choice between two acceptable and valid Scriptural expositions. According to the Commission, the 2009-decision accepts one interpretation as correct, and repudiates the other option as incorrect. This conclusion, for which no justification is presented, is false. The 2009-decision did not accept all the Scriptural evidence in favour of the NO-option as correct nor did it reject all the Scriptural evidence in favour of the YES-option as incorrect. In fact the decision about Scriptural evidence both for the YES- and NO-options was already made: NOTED (Acta 2009:665, 12.10.1). In order to affect a choice between two different options, both of which are founded on valid and acceptable Scriptural exegesis, one supposes that satisfactory Scriptural evidence is available to support the choice of one out of the two options. Such Scriptural evidence does not exist and was not presented for consideration in 2009 in making the decision.
4.2.2.6	In die lig van informasie wat nie	4.2.2.6	Objection 2, that the 2009-decision chose one of the two possible

waar is nie word beswaargrond 2, dat die 2009-besluit sonder grondige motivering vir een van die twee moontlike Skrif-verklarings kies, beoordeel en verkeerdelik afgewys (Acta 2016:70, 4.3.2.1).	Scriptural expositions without sound justification – was wrongly judged and rejected in light of information that is not true.
4.2.2.7 Die beswaar in beswaargrond 3 (Acta 2016:65, 3.3) dat die 2009-besluit vroue sonder Skrifgronde uitsluit van die besondere dienste van ouderlinge en predikante word in die lig van informasie wat nie waar is nie beoordeel en afgewys (Acta 2016:70, 4.5).	4.2.2.7 The objection in ground of objection 3 (Acta 2016:65, 3.3) to the effect that the 2009-decision excludes women from the particular services of ministers and elders without Scriptural justify-cation, is judged and rejected in the light of information that is not true.
4.2.2.8 In die beoordeling word die beswaar dat die 2009-besluit nie met Skrif-gronde gemotiveer is nie, afgewys as vals – 'n bewering wat nie waar is nie. Die beoordeling is nie waar nie maar vals – daar is geen Skrifgronde in en vir die 2009-besluit gegee nie.	4.2.2.8 In the adjudication of the objection that the 2009-decision was not justified on Scriptural grounds, the objection is repudiated as being false – a repudiation which is invalid. The adjudication is false – no Scriptural grounds were given for the 2009-decision.
4.2.2.9 Die stelling deur die Kommissie dat Skrifmotivering vir 2009-besluit ge-gee word deur die ondersteunde Skrifgegewens van die opsie wat gekies is, is nie waar nie. Die vorige besluit deur die afgevaardigdes van die GKSA in die Algemene Sinode 2009 om kennis te neem van die Skrifgetuienis (Acta 2009:665, 12.10.1), kan nie en is nie (KO, artt 31 en 46) deur die besluit wat die NEE-opsie kies (Acta 2009:667, 4) gewysig of verander nie.	4.2.2.9 The statement by the Commission that Scriptural justification for the 2009-decision is supplied by the supporting Scriptural material behind the chosen option, is not true. The preceding decision by the delegates of the GKSA in the General Synod 2009 to take note of the Scriptural material (Acta 2009:665, 12.10.1), was not altered and could not have been altered (CO, arts 31 and 46) by the decision to choose the NO-option (Acta 2009:667, 4).
4.2.2.10 Die stelling in beswaargrond 3 (Acta 2016:65, 3.3) dat die besluite deur afgevaardigdes na 'n Sinode duidelike en gemotiveerde Skrif-gronde vir die besluite aan die kerke moet gee, word afgemaak as ongeldig – 'n beoordeling wat self nie waar is nie (Acta 2016:70, 4.4.1.2).	4.2.2.10 The statement contained in ground of objection 3 (Acta 2016:65, 3.3) that the delegates to a Synod have to impart clear Scriptural justification to the churches for decisions, is rejected as false – a rejection which is invalid.
4.2.2.11 Dit is heeltemal waar dat die bewyslas – in die lig van Skrif, Belydenis en Kerkorde – by die beswaardes berus wat 'n besluit wil vernietig (KO, art 31) of verander (KO, art 46). MAAR dit is ook waar dat geldige motivering – in die lig van die Skrif, Belydenis en Kerkorde – gegee moet word	4.2.2.11 It is quite true that, in the light of Scripture, the Confession and the Church Order, the aggrieved who wish to annul (CO, art 31) or amend (CO, art 46) a church decision, shoulder the burden of proof. BUT it is also true that valid justification in the light of Scripture, the Confession and the Church Order should be provided

vir besluite wat afgevaardigdes van die kerke in meerdere vergaderings neem. So het die kerke ooreengekom in KO, art 33. Hierna word gevra in beswaargrond 3 – duidelike en gemotiveerde Skrifgronde vir die 2009-besluit. Die Kommissie se beoordeling dat dit nie nodig is nie, is in stryd met KO, art 33 en is nie waar nie.

for decisions taken by church delegates in major assemblies. This was mutually consented to by the churches in CO, art 33 and this is the fundamental demand in ground of objection 3 – clear and justifying Scriptural material supporting the 2009-decision is called for. The Commission's judgment that this is unnecessary, conflicts with CO, art 33 and boils down to information that is not true.

4.2.2.12 In die lig van informasie wat nie waar is nie word beswaargrond 3 beoordeel en verkeerdelik afgewys (Acta 2016:70, 4.4.2.1).

4.2.2.12 Ground of objection 3 is consequently judged and wrongly rejected on the basis of information that is not true (Acta 2016:70, 4.4.2.1).

4.2.3 Besluite : Beswaarskrif van GK Krugersdorp (Acta 2016:71-83)

4.2.3 Decisions : Petition of protest by the GK Krugersdorp (Acta 2016:71-83)

4.2.3.1 Die beswaar (Acta 2016:71, 2) dat die 2009-besluit sonder Skrifgronde lidmate se gewetens op grond van die meerderheidstem bind, word met informasie wat nie waar is nie verkeerdelik beoordeel en afgewys (Acta 2016:81, 4.1.2.1).

4.2.3.1 The objection (Acta 2016:72, 2) that the 2009-decision, lacking Scriptural justification, as it does, constrains the conscience of church members by means of the majority-vote, is wrongly adjudicated and rejected in the light of information that is not true (Acta 2016:81, 4.1.2.1).

4.2.3.2 Die beswaar word deur die Kommissie afgemaak as vals – 'n bevinding wat nie geldig is nie (Acta 2016:80, 4.1.1.1). Geen Skrifgronde word deur die Kommissie vir die 2009-besluit aangedui nie. Dit kan nie gedoen word nie, want daar is nie sodanige gronde nie.

4.2.3.2 The objection is rejected by the Commission as being false – an invalid judgment (Acta 2016:80, 4.1.1.1). No Scriptural grounds for the 2009-decision are advanced by the Commission. It would be impossible to do so, as no such grounds exist.

4.2.3.3 Al verdedig die Kommissie die meerderheidstem as die wyse waarop ons ooreengekom het om besluite te neem (KO, art 31), beteken dit nie dat die stem van die meerderheid gesag aan kerklike besluite gee nie. Alleen die Skrif gee gesag aan kerklike besluite. Informasie ten opsigte van die valse gesag van die meerderheidstem en die Belydenis is reeds in C. 2.2. en 2.3 hierbo uitgewys, as nie waar nie.

4.2.3.3 Even if the Commission defends the majority-vote as the method we agreed to (CO, art 31), it does not mean that the majority-vote bestows authority upon ecclesiastic decisions. Only Scripture bestows authority upon ecclesiastic decisions. The information regarding the false authority of majority votes and the Confession has already been pointed out in C. 2.2 and 2.3 above as an untruth.

4.2.3.4 Die beswaar is geldig en waar. Omdat daar geen Skrifmotivering vir die 2009-besluit gegee is nie, word gewetens deur die 2009-besluit met die valse gesag van die meerder-

4.2.3.4 The objection is valid and true. Because the 2009-decision lacks Scriptural justification, consciences are constrained by the false authority of the majority vote.

heidstem gebind.

4.2.3.5 Die beswaar (Acta 2016:74, 5.3.3.2) dat die 2009-besluit sekere Skrif-opdragte lukraak met Sinodale gesag op gelowige vroue afgedwing word, word sonder geldige bewysvoering verkeerdelik afgewys (Acta 2016:81, 4.2.2.1).

4.2.3.6 Informasie ten opsigte van die valse gesag van die kollegialisme is reeds uitgewys in C. 3.1. as nie waar nie.

4.2.3.7 Die Kommissie se stelling dat Presbiteriale kerkregering afgevaardigdes van die kerke verbind om besluite in meerdere vergaderings op grond van die Skrif, Belydenis en Kerkorde te neem, is waar. Die stelling word gemaak in die beoordeling van 'n beswaar teen die 2009-besluit. Hiermee word die valse indruk geskep dat die 2009-besluit op grond van die Skrif, Belydenis en Kerkorde geneem is. Die 2009-besluit is nie op grond van die Skrif, Belydenis en Kerkorde geneem nie. Aangesien Skrif- Belydenis- en Kerkorde-begronding vir die 2009-besluit ontbreek is die beswaar waar. Met Sinodale gesag, met valse gesag van die kollegialisme word een Skrif-opdrag op lidmate afgedwing. Daarom is beswaargrond 4 op hierdie punt, verkeerdelik afgewys (Acta 2016:81, 4.2.2.1).

4.3 *Motivering 3 : Beswaargrond 4 – Valsgesag : Valse besluit afgedwing*

Die besluit deur die afgevaardigdes van die GKSA in die Algemene Sinode in 2009 (Acta 2009:667, 4) bedien valse gesag en word met valse gesag op die kerke afgedwing.

4.3.1 <u>2009-besluit : Valse gesag afdwing</u>

4.3.1.1 Die 2009-besluit word voorgehou as vas en bindend vir die kerke (KO, artt 31 en 46).

4.3.1.2 Die nodige begronding vir besluite wat die kerke as vas en bindend

4.2.3.5 The objection (Acta 2016:74, 5.3.3.2) entails that the 2009-decision randomly forces certain Scriptural injunctions upon believing women by means of Synodical authority. This objection is wrongly rejected without any justification (Acta 2016:81, 4.2.2.1).

4.2.3.6 Information regarding the false authority of collegialism has already been pointed out above in C.3.1. as an untruth.

4.2.3.7 The statement by the Commission that Presbyterial church governance compels delegates to take decisions in major assemblies on grounds of Scripture, the Confession and the Church Order, is true. This statement is made in the adjudication of an objection against the 2009-decision. So doing, the false impression is created that the 2009-decision is taken on the grounds of Scripture, the Confession and the Church Order. However, the 2009-decision was not based on Scripture, the Confession or the Church Order. The objection is consequently quite valid. At the hand of Synodical authority, at the hand of the false authority of collegialism, a single Scriptural injunction is forced upon church members. Ground of objection 4 was wrongly rejected on this point (Acta 2016:81, 4.2.2.1).

4.3 *Justification 3 : Ground of Objection 4 – False Authority : Enforcing a false decision*

The decision by delegates of the GKSA assembled in the General Synod in 2009 (Acta 2009:667, 4) administers false authority and is also forced upon the churches with false authority.

4.3.1 <u>2009-Decision : Enforcing false authority</u>

4.3.1.1 The 2009 decision is presented as fixed and binding for the churches (CO, arts 31 and 46).

4.3.1.2 The necessary foundation, which the churches agreed on (CO, art 33) for decisions to be fixed and

aanvaar en waarop die kerke onderling ooreengekom het (KO, art 33) ontbreek. Geen Skrif-, Belydenis- en Kerkordelike-begronding is vir die 2009-besluit gegee nie.	binding is lacking. No justification from Scripture, the Confession or the Church Order was submitted for the 2009 decision.
4.3.1.3 Die Sinode het die besluit met meerderheid van stemme geneem.	4.3.1.3 The Synod took the decision by majority-vote.
4.3.1.4 Nie al die kerke, wat deur afvaardiging by die Algemene Sinode in 2009 teenwoordig was, het vir die NEE-opsie gestem nie. Op hierdie kerke word die 2009-besluit met valse gesag van die kollegialisme (Sinode het besluit) en die demokrasie (stem van die meer-derheid) as vas en bindend afgedwing.	4.3.1.4 Not all churches represented by delegation at the 2009 General Synod voted for the NO-option. These are the churches upon whom the 2009-decision is imposed by the false authority of collegialism (Synod decided) and democracy (majority vote) as if the decision is fixed and binding.
4.3.2 <u>2016-besluite : Valse gesag afdwing</u>	4.3.2 <u>2016-decisions : Enforcing false authority</u>
4.3.2.1 In die Rapport van die 'Kommissie Kerkregtelik' word daar gewaarsku teen die kollegialistiese siening dat die Sinode besluite neem en af forseer (Acta 2016:67; 79; 99; 131, 3.10).	4.3.2.1 The Report of the 'Commission Church polity' warns against the collegialistic view that Synods make and enforce decisions (Acta 2016:67; 79; 99;131, 3.10).
4.3.2.2 Tereg sê die Kommissie dat die Gereformeerde Kerke in ooreenstemming met die Presbiteriale kerkregering saam, op grond van die Skrif, Belydenis en Kerkorde, besluite neem.	4.3.2.2 The Commission states, correctly so, that the Reformed Churches make decisions, in accordance with Presbyterial church governance, on the basis of Scripture, the Confession and the Church Order.
4.3.2.3 Die opmerkings word gemaak in die beoordeling van besware teen die 2009-besluit.	4.3.2.3 These remarks by the Commission are made in the course of evaluating objections against the 2009-decision.
4.3.2.4 Hiermee skep die Kommissie valslik die indruk dat die 2009-besluit op grond van die Skrif, Belydenis en Kerkorde geneem is.	4.3.2.4 Hereby the Commission creates the false impression that the 2009-decision is founded upon Scripture, the Confession and the Church Order.
4.3.2.5 Die Skrif-, Belydenis- en Kerkordegronde vir die 2009-besluit word nie deur die Kommissie aangedui nie.	4.3.2.5 This alleged foundation of the 2009-decision is not identified by the Commission.
4.3.2.6 Omdat geldige gronde ontbreek is die waarskuwing deur die Kommissie waar ten opsigte van die 2009-besluit.	4.3.2.6 Due to the very lack of valid justification, the Commission's warning applies to the 2009 decision.
4.3.2.7 Die 2009-besluit word sonder geldige gronde as vas en bindend voorgehou. Daardeur word probeer om die 2009-besluit, met die valse gesag van kollegialisme en die valse gesag van die meerderheidstem, op kerke afgedwing.	4.3.2.7 This is an attempt to present the 2009-decision as fixed and binding on the false authority of collegialism and the false authority of the majority-vote. On this same basis, the decision is forced upon the churches.
4.3.3 <u>Klassisse besluite : Valse gesag af-</u>	4.3.3 <u>Decisions by Classes : Enforcing false authority</u>

dwing

Besluite deur Klassisse Pretoria Moot op 12 April 2016 (Acta:2016, 6.1) en Noordwes op 13 September 2016 (Acta:2016, 7, art 11) bevestig dat die 2009-besluit met valse gesag op kerke afgedwing word.

4.3.3.1 Besluit : Klassis Pretoria Moot

Die Klassis Pretoria Moot besluit om die volgende Beskrywingspunt te aanvaar.

1. Beskrywingspunt

"Met droefheid word gekonstateer dat kerke wat in stryd met besluite van Nasionale en Algemene Sinodes 1988, 2009 en 2016 vroue as ouderlinge en predikante bevestig (of bevestig het), hulleself deur sodanige optrede daadwerklik (de facto) van die ander kerke binne die kerkverband van die GKSA afskei. Die bede is dat daar inkeer sal kom sodat ons in eenheid van Woord en Gees saam kan vergader".

4.3.3.1.1 Informasie wat nie waar is nie kom in die Beskrywingspunt en sy motivering voor.

4.3.3.1.2 Valslik word die 1988-besluit oor die saak van die vrou in die besondere dienste as steeds geldend en daarom as vas en bindend voorgehou. Die Klassis en die Beskrywingspunt gee geen verwysing na die 1988-besluit nie. In 1988 het die afgevaardigdes deur die GKSA in die Nasionale Sinode besluit dat vroue nie in die besondere dienste van predikant, ouderling en diaken mag dien nie (Acta 1988:522, 3.7.3). Streek-sinode Bosveld het in 'n Beswaar-skrif betoog dat die 1988-besluit nog steeds vas en bindend is (Acta 2006:409-412, 20.1). 'n Besluit deur die afgevaardigdes van die GKSA in die Algemene Sinode in 2009 het bevestig dat die betoog van Streeksinode Bosveld nie waar is nie (Acta 2009:563-581, 21.13). Die 1988-besluit is ordelik gewysig en oopgestel vir verdere besluitneming (KO, art 46).

Decisions by Classis Pretoria Moot on 12 April 2016 (Acta 2016, 6.1) and by Classis Noordwes on 13 September 2016 (Acta 2016, 7, art 11) confirm that the 2009-decision is being enforced upon the churches with false authority.

4.3.3.1 Decision : Classis Pretoria Moot

The Classis Pretoria Moot decided to adopt the following Point of description.

1. Point of Discussion

(Free translation from Afrikaans)

"With sadness, we hereby place on record that churches that ordain or have ordained women as ministers or as elders in defiance of decisions by National and General Synods of 1988, 2009 and 2016, separates them de facto by doing so, from the other churches in our denomination as GKSA. Our prayer is that the guilty shall repent so that we may assemble in true unity of Word and Spirit".

4.3.3.1.1 Information that is not true appears in this Point of description and its justification.

4.3.3.1.2 The 1988-decision concerning the matter of women in the particular services of the church is falsely presented as if it is still valid and consequently remains fixed and binding. No reference to the 1988-decision is supplied either by the Classis or in the Point of description. In 1988 the delegates of the GKSA in the National Synod decided that women may not serve in the particular services of ministers, elders or deacons (Acta 1988:522, 3.7.3). In a Petition of protest, the Regional Synod Bosveld argued that the 1988 decision was still fixed and binding (Acta 2006:409-412, 20.1). However, the delegates of the GKSA, assembled in the General Synod in 2009, confirmed that the argument by Regional Synod Bosveld was not true (Acta 2009:563-581, 21.13). In an orderly fashion the 1988-decision was amended and re-

	opened for further deliberations (CO, art 46).
4.3.3.1.3 Die Klassis Pretoria Moot en die Beskrywingspunt wat deur hulle aanvaar is, gee geen aanduiding vir die besluit in 2016 waarna verwys word nie. Valslik word die indruk geskep dat die afgevaardigdes van die GKSA in die Buitengewone Algemene Sinode in 2016 besluit het dat vroue nie in die besondere dienste van predikante en ouderlinge mag dien nie. So 'n besluit word nie in die Handelinge (Acta 2016) gevind nie.	4.3.3.1.3 The Classis Pretoria Moot and the Point of description that was accepted by them do not identify the decision in 2016 that is referred to. A false impression is thus created as if the delegates of the GKSA, in the Extraordinary General Synod in 2016 decided that women may not serve in the particular services of ministers and of elders. A decision to this effect cannot be found in the acta (Acta 2016).
4.3.3.1.4 Die Beskrywingspunt bedien, in stryd met die Presbiteriale kerkregering en die bepalings van die Kerkorde, die valse hoogmoedige gesag van kollegialisme.	4.3.3.1.4 The said Point of description administers the false and high-minded authority of collegialism.
4.3.3.1.5 Met die aanvaarding van die Beskrywingspunt het die afgevaardigdes van 'n paar kerke in Klassis Pretoria Moot 'n besluit oor ander kerke en namens ander kerke geneem. In Presbiteriale kerkregering is 'n besluit deur afgevaardigdes in 'n meerdere vergadering bindend vir die kerke wat in die vergadering verteenwoordig is.	4.3.3.1.5 Having adopted the Point of description, the delegates from a number of churches in Classis Pretoria Moot, in fact took a decision on behalf of and about other churches. According to precepts of Presbyterial church governance, a decision by delegates in a major assembly is binding for the churches represented in the assembly.
4.3.3.1.6 Met die aanvaarding van die genoemde Beskrywingspunt word daar probeer om die valse gesag wat die 2009-besluit bedien – soos beswaargronde 1, 2, 3 en 4 van die Beswaarskrif aantoon – met valse gesag op kerke af te dwing. Die besluit verhef, in stryd met die Belydenis (NGB, artt 28 en 29) die gehoorsame nakoming van Sinodebesluite tot voorwaarde vir kerk-eenheid.	4.3.3.1.6 The adoption of the said Point of description is an attempt to enforce the false authority administered by the 2009-decision – as witnessed by grounds of objection 1, 2, 3 and 4 of this Petition of protest – upon the churches. The decision elevates, in contradiction to the Confession (BC, arts 28 and 29) the obedient observance of Synodical decisions as a condition for church unity.
4.3.3.1.7 Die Beskrywingspunt en die besluit om dit te aanvaar is in stryd met die weg van Matteus 18 en die bepalings van die Kerkorde (artt 31 en 46) om kerklike besluite ordelik te skrap of te wysig. Die besluit toon dat daar nie, met die kerke wat deur die besluite veroordeel en afgesny word, kontak gemaak is nie. Die kerke word onregverdig,	4.3.3.1.7 The Point of description and the said decision adopting it are both in conflict with the way indicated in Mathew 18 and the Church Order (CO, arts 31 and 46) to orderly annul or amend ecclesiastical decisions. The decision bears witness to the fact that no contact was made with churches that, by this decision, are condemned and excommunicated.

sonder om gehoor te word, veroordeel.	These churches are unjustly condemned without being heard.
4.3.3.1.8 Die Beskrywingspunt wil kerke valslik dwing om die 2009-besluit gehoorsaam na te kom. Kerke word, in stryd met KO, artt 31 en 46, die reg ontneem om die 2009-besluit te wysig of te skrap.	4.3.3.1.8 The Point of description falsely coerces churches into obeying the 2009-decision. In conflict with CO, arts 31 and 46, churches are deprived of the right to have the 2009-decision amended or deleted.
4.3.3.1.9 Informasie wat nie waar is nie kom in die motivering van die Beskrywingspunt voor. Valslik word beweer dat die in die lig van die Skrif, Belydenis en Kerkorde besluit het dat vroue nie as predikante en ouderlinge mag dien nie. Nie die Klassis of die Beskrywingspunt gee enige verwysing na Skrif-, Belydenis- en Kerkordelike-begronding vir so 'n besluit, vir die 2009-besluit nie (Acta 2009:667, 4).	4.3.3.1.9 Information that is not true appears in the justification of the Point of description. It is falsely alleged that delegates of the GKSA decided, in accordance with Scripture, the Confession and the Church Order that women may not serve in the particular offices of ministers and elders. Neither the Classis nor the Point of description identifies any grounds from Scripture, the Confession or the Church Order to justify the 2009-decision (Acta 2009:667, 4).
4.3.3.1.9.1 Die 2009-besluit, wat sonder enige Skrif-, Belydenis- of Kerkordelike begronding vir die NEE-opsie kies, word verabsoluteer.	4.3.3.1.9.1 The 2009-decision is, in spite of the absence of justification based on Scripture, the Confession or the Church Order, singled out and raised to an absolute truth in itself.
4.3.3.1.9.2 Die waarheid waartoe jarelange Skrifstudie gekom het, word verswyg (Acta 2009:583-664). Die waarheid is dat daar in die lig van die Skrif 2 (twee) opsies is oor die vrou in die besondere dienste. In die lig van die Skrif is daar 'n geldige en aanvaarbare gevolgtrekking gemaak dat vroue in die besondere dienste mag dien (Acta 2009:664, 10.15.1a).	4.3.3.1.9.2 No mention is made regarding the truth gained by extensive studies of Scripture over many years (Acta 2009:583-664). The truth is that in the light of Scripture there are to 2 (two) options regarding women in the particular offices. One of these is the valid and acceptable conclusion in the light of Scripture, that women may serve in the particular offices (Acta 2009:664, 10.15.1a).
4.3.3.1.9.3 Geen geldige motivering is gegee waarom daar in die 2009-besluit vir die een opsie en nie vir die ander opsie gekies is nie. Die feit dat daar in die lig van die Skrif twee geldige opsies is beteken, dat 'n keuse vir een opsie sonder enige geldige motivering neerkom op die afdwing van die opsie.	4.3.3.1.9.3 No valid justification was supplied for the choice made by the 2009-decision, in favour of one option and not for the other. The fact that there are 2 (two) valid option in the light of Scripture, the decision to choose one without any valid justification, boils down to enforcement of the chosen option.
	4.3.3.1.9.4 With false authority, one

4.3.3.1.9.4 Een opsie word met valse gesag afgedwing omdat Skrif-, Belydenis- en Kerkorde-begronding vir die besluit ontbreek.	option is enforced, because the choice lacks justification from Scripture, the Confession and the Church Order.
4.3.3.1.10 Die veralgemening (Klassis Acta 2016: art 6.1, 2.2), dat besware teen die genoemde besluite almal op grond van die Skrif, Belydenis en Kkerkorde afgewys is, is informasie wat nie waar is nie. Die veralgemening word nie met verwysings bevestig nie. Die beswaargronde van hierdie Beswaarskrif toon aan dat daar besware teen die 2009-besluit is wat duidelik nie op grond van Skrif, Belydenis en Kerkorde afgewys is nie.	4.3.3.1.10 The very general observation (Classis Acta 2016: art 6.1, 2.2), that objections against the said decisions were all rejected on grounds from Scripture, the Confession and the Church Order, is not true. The truth thereof is not confirmed by any reference at all. The grounds of objection raised in this Petition of protest, indicate that there were objections against the 2009 decision that were clearly rejected without any justification on grounds from Scripture, the Confession or from the Church Order.
4.3.3.1.11 Die bewering (Klassis Acta 2016: art 6.1, 2.3), dat die kerke in 2015 gesê het die saak van die vrou in die leer- en regeeramp is ‘n wesentlike saak, is nie waar nie. Geen verwysing word na die uitspraak of besluit gegee nie. In die Notule en die Handelinge van die Algemene Sinode in 2015 is daar nie ‘n besluit wat bepaal dat die saak van die vrou – soos weergegee in die motivering van die Beskrywingspunt – in die leer- en regeeramp ‘n wesentlik saak is nie.	4.3.3.1.11 The allegation (Classis Acta 2016: art 6.1, 2.3), that in 2015 the churches found the matter of women serving in the governing services of ministers and of elders to be an essential matter of the faith, is not true. No reference is made to any relevant decision or judgment. The Minutes and the Acta of the 2015 General Synod contain no decision directing that the matter of women – as represented in the Classis Point of description – serving in the particular offices constitutes an essential matter.
4.3.3.1.12 Die feit dat daar in die lig van die Skrif 2 (twee) geldige en aanvaarbare gevolgtrekkings gemaak is (Acta 2009:664, 10.15.1a en 10.15.1b) bevestig dat die saak van die vrou in die besondere dienste nie ‘n wesentlike saak is nie. Sake waaroor gelowiges in die lig van die Skrif kan verskil is nie-wesentlike sake nie (Rom 14). Die waarheid word bevestig deur die afgevaardigdes van die GKSA in die Algemene Sinode in 2015 se besluit oor riglyne om tussen wesentlike en nie-wesentlike sake te onderskei.	4.3.3.1.12 The fact that Scripture allows for 2 (two) valid and acceptable conclusions (Acta 2009:664, 10.15.1a and 10.15.1b), confirms that the matter of women serving in the particular services is not an essential matter. Matters in which believers may differ in the light of Scripture are non-essential (Rom 14). This truth is confirmed by the delegates of the GKSA in the General Synod in 2015 deciding on guidelines according to which a distinction may be drawn between essential and non-essential

(Acta 2015:322-323, 3). Beoordeel aan die hand van die riglyne, is saak van die vrou in die besondere dienste, 'n nie-wesentlike saak.

4.3.3.1.13 Die besluit deur die afgevaardigdes van Gereformeerde Kerke na Klassis Pretoria Moot van 12 April 2016 (Acta:2016, 6.1), om die Beskrywingspunt te aanvaar is in stryd met die mandaat (KO, art 33) wat afgevaardigdes van die plaaslike kerke ontvang het.

4.3.3.1.14 Afgevaardigdes het die mandaat om in die lig van die Skrif, Belydenis en Kerkorde oor sake te oordeel en te besluit. In die motivering van die Beskrywingspunt word daar verwys na Skrif, Belydenis en Kerkorde (Klassis Acta 2016: art 6.1, 2.2). Die Beskrywingspunt self en sy motivering gee geen verwysing na die Skrif, Belydenis en Kerkorde-begronding vir die besluit nie.

4.3.3.1.15 Kerke beskou ALLEEN besluite wat in die lig van die Skrif, Belydenis en Kerkorde geneem is as vas en bindend. In die lig van KO, art 33 is die besluit waardeur die Beskrywingspunt aanvaar is, nie vas en bindend vir die kerke wat deur afgevaardigdes in daardie Klassis verteenwoordig was nie en ook nie vir die kerke wat nie daarin verteenwoordig was nie.

4.3.3.1.16 Sonder grondige motivering vir die 2009-besluit en vir die besluit deur die afgevaardigdes in Klassis Pretoria Moot van 12 April 2016 word daar probeer om die besluite, wat valse gesag bedien, met valse gesag op die kerke af te dwing.

4.3.3.2 <u>Besluit : Klassis Noordwes</u>

In die lig van 'n Adviesvraag (KO, art 41) neem die afgevaardigdes deur Gereformeerde Kerke na Klassis Noordwes op 16 September 2016 die volgende besluit (Acta 2016:7, art 11):

matters (Acta 2015:322-323, 3). Judged at the hand of these guidelines, the matter of women serving in the particular services is a non-essential matter.

4.3.3.1.13 The decision of the delegates of Reformed churches to Classis Pretoria Moot of 12 April 2016 (Acta: 2016, 6.1) to approve this point of description is contrary to the mandate (CO, art 33) received by delegates from the local churches.

4.3.3.1.14 Delegates have the mandate to judge and decide on matters in the light of Scripture, Confession and Church Order. The justification of the proposal, refers to Scripture, Confession and Church Order (Classis Acta 2016: art 6.1, 2.2). BUT the Point of description itself and its justification give no own justification for the decision based on Scripture, the Confession or the Church Order.

4.3.3.1.15 Churches ONLY acknowledge decisions taken in the light of Scripture, Confession and Church Order as fixed and binding. In the light of CO, art 33, the decision that accepted the point of the description is not fixed and binding for the churches represented by delegates in that Classis, nor for the churches that were not represented in it.

4.3.3.1.16 Without proper justification for the 2009-decision and for the decision by delegates in the Pretoria Moot Classis of 12 April 2016, both these decisions attempt to administer false authority and to enforce decisions on the churches with false a authority.

4.3.3.2 <u>Decision: North West Classis</u>

In the light of an advisory question (CO, art 41), delegates of the Reformed Churches to Classis Noordwes on 16 September 2016 made the following decision (Acta 2016:7, art 11):

(Free translation from Afrikaans)

"*1. Ons hou by die Kerkorde as ons werkswyse.* *2. Ons aanvaar dat besluite van meerdere vergaderings vas en bindend is.* *3. Ons aanvaar dat as gemeentes hulle nie hou by besluite van meerdere vergaderings nie, hulle hulleself losmaak van die kerkverband. Ons versoek hulle om hulle te hou by bestaande besluite.* *Besluit: Die vergadering neem hierdie besluit met 'n meerderheid van stemme. Die vergadering besluit ook om hierdie besluit bekend te maak aan die kerkverband*".	"*1. We adhere to the Church Order.* *2. We accept that resolutions of major assemblies are fixed and binding.* *3. We assume that if churches do not abide by resolutions of major assemblies, they separate themselves from the Reformed Churches. We ask them to adhere to existing decisions.* *Decision: The meeting takes this decision by majority vote. The meeting also decided to announce this decision to the other churches".*
4.3.3.2.1 Met die besluit bevestig die afgevaardigdes na die Klassis die kerke se verbintenis tot die onderlinge ooreenkoms in die Kerkorde. Die stelling dat besluite van meerdere vergaderings vas en bindend is, is 'n veralgemening wat nie reg laat geskied aan die onderlinge ooreenkoms in die Kerkorde nie.	4.3.3.2.1 With this decision, the delegates confirm the churches' commitment to the mutual agreement in the Church Order. The statement that resolutions of major assemblies are binding and binding is a generalization that does not do justice to the mutual agreement in the Church Order.
4.3.3.2.2 Die Kerkorde bepaal nie dat alle besluite van alle meerdere vergaderings altyd vir almal vas en bindend is nie. Die Gereformeerde Kerke het onderling ooreengekom (KO, artt 30, 31 en 33) watter besluite vas en bindend vir die kerke is. Besluite deur afgevaardigdes van Gereformeerde Kerke in meerdere vergaderings, wat in die lig van die Skrif, Belydenis en Kerkorde geneem is, is vas en bindend.	4.3.3.2.2 The Church Order does not determine that all decisions of all major assemblies are always fixed and binding on all. The Reformed Churches have agreed (CO, arts 30, 31 and 33) which decisions are fixed and binding on the churches. Decisions by delegates of Reformed Churches in major assemblies, taken in the light of Scripture, the Confession and the Church Order, are fixed and binding.
4.3.3.2.3 Die besluit dat kerke wat hulle nie hou by besluite van meerdere verga-derings nie hulleself losmaak van die kerkverband (Acta 2016:7, art 11, 2), verhef in stryd met die Belydenis (NGB, artt 28 en 29) die gehoorsame nakoming van Sinodebesluite tot voorwaarde vir kerk-eenheid.	4.3.3.2.3 The decision that churches who do not adhere to the decisions of major assemblies separate themselves from the Reformed Churches (Acta 2016:7, art 11, 2), elevates the obedient adherence to Synod decisions as a condition for church unity. This is in conflict with our Confession (BC, arts 28 and 29)
4.3.3.2.4 Die besluit is ook in stryd met die weg van Matteus 18 en die bepalings van die Kerkorde (KO, artt 31 en 46) om kerklike besluite, ook die van plaaslike kerke, ordelik te skrap of te wysig.	4.3.3.2.4 The decision is also contrary to Matthew 18 and the provisions of the Church Order (CO arts 31 and 46) as the way in which ecclesiastic decisions, including those of a local church may be annulled or amended.

4.4 *Bevinding : Beswaargrond 4*	4.4 *Conclusion : Ground of Objection 4*
4.4.1 Die 2009-besluit word sonder geldige motivering met valse gesag aan die kerke voorgehou as vas en bindend. Met valse gesag word die besluit op kerke en gelowiges afgedwing.	4.4.1 Without sound justification the 2009-decision is, with false authority, presented to the churches as fixed and binding. The decision is being enforced on churches and believers with false authority.
4.4.2 Op grond van informasie wat nie waar is nie, is besware teen die 2009-besluit deur die afgevaardigdes van die GKSA in die 2016 Buitengewone Algemene Sinode, verkeerdelik afgewys. Daardeur word die 2009-besluit met valse gesag op die kerke en gelowiges afgedwing.	4.4.2 On the basis of information that is not true, objections to the 2009-decision were wrongly rejected by the delegates of the Reformed Churches in South Africa in the 2016 Extraordinary General Synod. In consequence the 2009-decision is enforced on churches and believers with false authority.
4.4.3 Die leiding van die Heilige Gees in die beoordeling van die besware word misbruik om die besware verkeerdelik af te wys. Daardeur word die 2009-besluit met valse gesag op die kerke afgedwing.	4.4.3 The guidance of the Holy Spirit in the appraisal of the objections is misused to erroneously reject the objections. As a result, the 2009-decision is enforced on the churches with false authority.
4.4.4 Die besluite deur Klassisse Pretoria Moot en Noordwes bevestig dat die 2009-besluit met valse gesag op kerke afgedwing word. Die besluite deur die Klassisse gee geen aanduiding vir die Skrifgronde vir hulle eie besluite of vir die 2009-besluit nie.	4.4.4 The decisions by Classes Pretoria Moot and North West confirm that the 2009-decision is imposed on churches with false authority. The decisions by the Classes indicate no Scriptural grounds for their own decisions, nor do they mention any Scriptural justification for the 2009-decision.
4.4.5 Op grond van die valse voorstelling dat die saak van die vrou in die besondere dienste ‘n wesentlike saak is, word die saak strydig met ander bevindings, verhef tot ‘n belydenis-saak.	4.4.5 Due to the false representation that the matter of women serving in the special offices is an essential matter, the matter, is elevated to a Confession-matter, contrary to other findings.
4.4.6 Geen motivering word gegee waarom die gehoorsame nakoming van Sinodebesluite ‘n voorwaarde vir kerk-eenheid is nie.	4.4.6 No justification is given why the obedient adherence to Synod decisions is a prerequisite for church unity.
4.4.7 Sinodebesluite wat deur feilbare sondaar-mense geneem word, kan nie ‘n voorwaarde vir kerk-eenheid wees nie.	4.4.7 Synodical decisions, made by fallible sinners, cannot be a pre-requisite for church unity.
4.4.8 In stryd met die Presbiteriale regeringstelsel probeer die Klassisse met die besluite om die 2009-besluit met valse gesag op die kerke af te dwing.	4.4.8 Contrary to the Presbyterial system of church governance the Classes try to enforce the 2009-decision on the churches with false authority.
	D. CONCLUSION : PETITION OF

D. SLOT : BESWAARSKRIF	PROTEST
1. Samevatting : Beswaarskrif	**1. Summary : Protest**
1.1 Die afgevaardigdes deur die GKSA na die Algemene Sinode in 2009 het in gebreke gebly om motivering te gee vir die besluit (Acta 2009:667, 4) dat vroue nie in die besondere dienste van predikante en ouderlinge mag dien nie. Daardeur het hulle buite hulle mandaat (KO, art 33) opgetree.	1.1 Delegates of the Reformed churches to the General Synod in 2009 failed to justify the decision (Acta 2009:667, 4) that women may not serve in the particular offices of ministers and elders. So doing, they exceeded their mandate (CO, art 33).
1.2 Sonder geldige motivering uit die Skrif, Belydenis en Kerkorde:	1.2 Lacking valid foundation in Scripture, the Confession and the Church Order:
1.2.1 bedien die 2009-besluit nie ware gesag nie maar valse gesag;	1.2.1 the 2009-decision administers false authority and not true authority;
1.2.2 is die 2009-besluit in die lig van die onderlinge ooreenkoms in KO, art 33, nie vas en bindend vir die kerke nie.	1.2.2 the 2009-decision,in the light of the mutual agreement in art 33 CO, is not fixed and binding upon the churches;
1.3 Die beswaargronde in hierdie Beswaar-skrif en hulle motiverings dui aan dat die 2009-besluit valse gesag, en nie die gesag van Christus in gehoorsaam-heid aan sy Woord bedien nie.	1.3 The grounds of objection set out in this Petition of protest; taken together with their justification, indicate that the 2009-decision administers false authority and not the authority of Christ in obedience to Scripture.
1.4 ‘n Besluit – soos die 2009-besluit – wat valse gesag bedien, kan nie en en mag nie as vas en bindend op die kerke afgedwing word nie.	1.4 A decision such as that of 2009, that administers false authority cannot and may not be forced upon churches as if it is fixed and binding.
1.5 In die lig van die feit dat jare se Skrifstudie op grond van houdbare en aanvaarbare Skrifverklaring tot 2 (twee) moontlike opsies in die lig van die Skrif gelei het (Acta 2009:664, 10.16), bevestig dat die saak van die vrou in die besondere dienste nie ‘n wesentlike saak is nie. Solank daar nie grondige Skrif-, Belydenis- en Kerkordelike-motivering is om tussen die 2 opsies te kies nie, kan die kerke nie so ‘n besluit neem nie.	1.5 In the light of the fact that years of Bible study and valid and acceptable Scriptural exegeses rendered 2 (two) possible options (Acta 2009:664, 10.15) confirms that the matter of women serving in the particular services is not an essential matter. As long as there is no valid justification, in the light of Scripture, the Confession or the Church Order, for choosing between the two options, the churches cannot make such a decision.
1.6 Die 2016-besluite het op grond van informasie wat nie waar is nie, besware deur kerke teen die 2009-besluit verkeerdelik afgewys. Daardeur word die 2009-besluit deur die 2016-besluite met valse gesag op kerke afgedwing.	1.6 Due to information that is not true the 2016-decisions wrongly denounced the protests brought by chuches against the 2009-decision. In doing this, the 2009-decision are being forced upon the churches with false authority.
2. Versoek : Beswaarskrif	**2. Request : Petition of protest**
2.1 Die afgevaardigdes deur die GKSA wat DV in die Algemene Sinode 2018 vergader word versoek om in die lig van	2.1 The delegates of the Reformed Churches in South Africa who are to assemble DV in the General Synod 2018, are requested to decide as follows in the light of this Petition and

die Beswaarskrif en die motiverings daarin gegee te besluit dat:	the justifications expressed therein:
2.1.1 geen motivering vir die 2009-besluit gegee is nie (Acta 2009:667, 4);	2.1.1 that no justification was supplied for the 2009 decision (Acta 2009:667, 4);
2.1.2 die 2009-besluit sonder geldige motivering nie vas en bindend vir die Gereformeerde Kerke is nie.	2.1.2 that the 2009 decision, lacking justification, as it does, is not fixed and binding upon the Reformed Churches.
3. Bibliografie	**3. Bibliography:**
3.1 Du Plooy, A. Le R. 1994. Ekklésia en meerdere vergaderings. (Ongepubliseerde verhandeling – PU vir CHO). Potchefstroom.	3.1 Du Plooy, A le R 1994, Ekklésia en meerdere vergaderings. (Unpublished treatise, PU for CHE), Potchefstroom.
3.2 Spoelstra, B. 1989. Gereformeerde Kerkreg en Kerkregering – 'n Handboek by die Kerkorde.	3.2 Spoelstra, B. 1989, Gereformeerde Kerkreg en Kerkregering – 'n Handboek by die Kerkorde.
3.3 Van der Linde, G.P.L. 1983. 'n Verklaring van die Gereformeerde Kerkorde. T.G van Wyk, Pretoria.	3.3 Van der Linde, G.P.L. 1983, 'n Verklaring van die Gereformeerde Kerkorde. TG Van Wyk, Pretoria.
Toeligter:	*Elucidator*: