27.8 BESWAARSKRIF: STREEKSINODE PRETORIA – TEEN KERKGROEIBEDIENING EN SUSTENTASIE (Artt 24, 27, 110, 112)

27.8 PETITION OF PROTEST: REGIONAL SYNOD PRETORIA – AGAINST CHURCH GROWTH AND SUSTENTATION (Arts 24, 27, 110, 112)

A. Streeksinode Pretoria dui aan dat geen toeligting gegee word nie.
Regional Synod Pretoria indicates that no elucidation is given.

B. **Besluit:** Die Beswaarskrif word verwys na Kommissie Beswaarskrifte 1.
Decision: The Point of Protest is referred to Commission Gravamina 1.

C. Dr C Jooste rapporteer namens Kommissie Beswaarskrifte 1.
Dr C Jooste reports on behalf of Commission Gravamina 1.

D. **Besluit:** Die Kommissie moet die Sinode adviseer oor die gevolge van die besluit.
Decision: The Commission must advise the Synod on the consequences of the decision.

E. Dr C Jooste hou die gevolg van die besluit geneem rakende die Beswaarskrif van Streeksinode Pretoria, mondeling aan die Sinode voor: *Die gevolg hiervan is dat 3.1 en 3.2 van Sinode 2018 se besluit verval. Klassisse kan egter kerke aanmoedig om van die bedieningshulp van Expando gebruik te maak.*
Besluit: Die uiteensetting van die gevolg word goedgekeur.
Dr C Jooste orally presents the result of the decision taken regarding the Gravamen of Regional Synod Pretoria, to the Synod: *The result of this is that 3.1 and 3.2 of the decision of Synod 2018 lapse. However, Classes can encourage churches to make use of Expando's ministry help.*
Decision: The statement of the consequence is approved.

F. **BESWAARSKRIF / PETITION OF PROTEST**

Besluit waarteen beswaar gemaak word	**Objection is made against**
Die besluit word gevind Acta 2018:1101, 3	The decision in Acta 2018:1101, 3
"3. Aanbevelings	**"3. *Recommendations***
3.1 *Dat die Kerkgroeideputate in samewerking met die betrokke Klassisse 'n werkswyse daarstel om te verseker dat kerke wat sustentasie van die kerkverband ontvang, gebruik maak van die dienste van OBTB (Expando).*	*3.1 That the Church Growth Deputies, in collaboration with the involved Classes, develop a mechanism for ensuring that churches who receive sustenance from the churches also make use of the services of the OBTB (Expando).*
Besluit: Goedgekeur	***Decision: Approved***
3.2 Dat hierdie werkswyse sou insluit dat die OBTB (Expando) by wyse van vorderingsverslae advies aan die Sustentasie Deputate sou gee vir hulle oorweging van Sustentasieaansoeke.	*3.2 That the mechanism would include that the OBTB (Expando) would give advice top the Sustentation Deputies by way of progress reports, for their consideration of Sustentation applications.*
Besluit: Goedgekeur."	***Decision: Approved."***
Beswaargrond 1	**Basis of protest 1**
Die besluit bevat 'n innerlike teenstrydigheid.	The decision contains an intrinsic discrepancy.
Beredenering	**Motivation**
Sustentasie is inderdaad ondersteuning vanuit die kerkverband aan Kerkrade om te verseker	Sustentation is support from churches for the local church, to assure the continuation of the

dat Woordbediening kan voortgaan in ‘n gemeente (vgl. KO, art 41). Terwyl die besluit hierdie beginsel van sustentasie erken, word daar tog ‘n instansie (OBTB) buite die Sustentasiedeputate aangewys as bepalend vir sustentasie en so aan OBTB die reg gegee tot inspraak in die voortgang van Woordbediening in gemeentes (vgl. KO, art 84).	preaching of God’s Word (cf. CO, art 41). Whilst the decision acknowledges the principle of sustentation, an organisation (OBTB) is appointed from without the Deputies for Sustentation, to determine the sustentation. In this way power is given to the OBTB to make decisions about the preaching of God’s Word in the local congregation (cf. CO, art 84).
Beswaargrond 2 Die besluit is in stryd met KO, art 49	**Basis of protest 2** The decision is contrary to CO art. 49
Beredenering Die Deputate Sustentasie het reeds ‘n welomskrewe opdrag en ‘n volledige Rreglement (vgl. Reglement vir Sustentasie (AS 2015:98-104)), waarvolgens gemeentes aansoek moet doen vir sustentasie. Die besluit gee aan ‘n ander instansie die reg tot advies waardeur die Deputate se opdrag verander word.	**Motivation** The Deputies for Sustentation already have a well-defined mandate and a comprehensive set of rules when application is made for sustenance (cf. Regulations for Sustentation (GS 2015:98-104)). This decision gives the right of advice to another body. Thereby the mandate of the Deputies for Sustentation is changed.
Beswaargrond 3 Die besluit tas die selfstandigheid van die plaaslike kerk aan.	**Basis of protest 3** The decision impairs the independence of the local congregation.
Beredenering Kerkrade wat reeds deur baie ingewikkelde stappe moet gaan wat ook goedkeuring van hulle aansoek insluit deur die Klassis en Streeksinode, voordat ‘n aansoek oorweeg word deur die Nasionale Deputate vir Sustentasie, word nou onderwerp aan 1. Die vereiste van lidmaatskap van Expando 2. Vorderingsverslae 3. Die implementering van ‘n Gemeente Groeiproses 4. Deelname van die Kerkraad aan geleenthede soos die Vlamvat Konferensie 5. ‘n Natural Church Development verslag wat voor die Deputate moet dien voor die oorweging van sustentasie.	**Motivation** Church Councils must already go through an intricate process to apply for sustenance. This includes approval of the application by the Classis and the Regional Synod even before the application is considered by the General Deputies. By this decision councils are subjected to: 1. Mandatory membership of Expando 2. Progress reports 3. The implementation of a Process for Church Growth 4. Participation by the council in events like the “Vlamvat” conference 5. A Natural Church Development report which must be tabled at the deputies before deliberation on sustenance.
Streeksinode Pretoria versoek dat die besluit van die Sinode op hierdie gronde herroep word en elke aansoek deur die aangewese Deputate vir Sustentasie op meriete oorweeg word, sonder die insette van buite-instansies.	Regional Synod Pretoria ask that the decision of the General Synod is recalled on these grounds and that every application for sustenance will be considered by the appointed Sustentation Deputies on merit, without input from external institutions.

G. **RAPPORT: KOMMISSIE BESWAARSKRIFTE 1**
REPORT: COMMISSION GRAVAMINA 1

1. Opdrag Adviseer die Sinode op die meriete van die Beswaarskrif. **Besluit: Kennis geneem.**	**1. Mandate** Advise the Synod on the merits of the Gravamen. **Decision: Noted.**
2. Sake waarvan die Sinode kennis neem	**2. Matters that the Synod takes note of**
2.1 *Inleidende opmerkings* Die Kommissie geleentheid aan broeders gegee om die Kommissie te spreek. Ds BC Smit, prof G Breed en dr G van Wyk het die Kommissie gespreek.	2.1 *Introductory remarks* The Commission gave opportunity for brothers to consult with the Commission. Rev. BC Smit, prof G Breed and dr G van Wyk consulted with the Commission.
2.2 *Beswaargrond 1*	2.2 *Ground for objection 1*
2.2.1 Beredenering Die beswaardes beweer dat die besluit waarteen beswaar gemaak word 'n inherente teenstrydigheid bevat deurdat kerke wat vir sustentasie aansoek doen se meewerking met Expando bepalend is vir die oorweging van die betrokke aansoek. Die beswaardes wys daarop dat die sustentasie aansoek onderhewig is aan 'n ander instansie as alleen die Sustentasiedeputate.	2.2.1 Argumentation The aggrieved claim that the decision against which objection is made contains an inherent contradiction by making it decisive for churches who apply for sustentation to work with Expando in the consideration of sustentation requests. The aggrieved point out that the sustentation request is hereby subjected to another institution other than the Sustentation Deputies alone.
2.2.2 Bevinding Die Kommissie oordeel dat Expando se betrokkenheid wel bepalend is soos dit in die huidige besluit verwoord word. Uit gesprek met die toeligters blyk dit egter dat Expando sy bedieningshulp nie as 'n voorvereiste om te kwalifiseer vir sustentasie sien nie. Die besluit skep egter die persepsie dat dit wel so verstaan kan word.	2.2.2 Finding The Commission finds that Expando's involvement is indeed decisive as it is worded in the current decision. After discussion with the brothers who explained Expando's involvement, it was mentioned that Expando's involvement is not decisive. The decision, however, gives the perception that it could be understood that involvement of Expando is decisive.
2.2.3 Aanbeveling Beswaargrond 1 slaag.	2.2.3 Recommendation Ground for objection 1 succeeds.
2.3 *Beswaargrond 2*	2.3 *Ground for objection 2*
2.3.1 Beredenering Die beswaardes voer aan dat die besluit in stryd is met KO, art 49 wat bepaal dat Deputate 'n welomskrewe opdrag van die Sinode ontvang. Die besluit van 2018 sou dan volgens die beswaardes die opdrag van die Sustentasiedeputate verander deurdat Expando se advies die deurslag in die oorweging van 'n sustentasie aansoek	2.3.1 Argumentation The aggrieved argue that the decision is in contradiction with CO, art 49 which determine that Deputies receive a well-described mandate from the Synod. The decision of 2018 would then, according to the aggrieved, change the mandate of the Sustentation Deputies by giving Expando's advice a decisive role in the consideration of the

sou gee en dus in stryd met KO, art 49 is.	sustentation request and is thus in contradiction with CO, art 49.
2.3.2 Bevinding Die Kommissie oordeel dat die beswaardes nie aantoon dat die advies van Expando die opdrag of reglement van die Sustentasiedeputate verander nie en is dus nie in stryd met KO, art 49 nie.	2.3.2 Finding The Commission finds that the aggrieved did not prove that the advice of Expando changes the mandate or the regulations of the Sustentation Deputies, and is thus not in contradiction with CO, art 49.
2.3.3 Aanbeveling Beswaargrond 2 slaag nie.	2.3.3 Recommendation Ground for objection 2 does not succeed.
2.4 *Beswaargrond 3*	2.4 *Ground for objection 3*
2.4.1 Beredenering Die beswaardes voer aan dat die selfstandigheid van die plaaslike kerk in gedrang gebring word deurdat betrokkenheid by Expando 'n vereiste word vir die toekenning van sustentasie.	2.4.1 Argumentation The aggrieved argue that the independence of the local church is being jeopardized by the prerequisite involvement of Expando when considering a request for Sustentation.
2.4.2 Bevinding Die Kommissie oordeel dat die huidige besluit wel so verstaan kan word dat die betrokkenheid by Expando as vereiste gestel word vir die toekenning van sustentasie. Op hierdie manier word voorgeskryf op watter manier 'n Kerkraad sy bediening moet inrig.	2.4.2 Finding The Commission finds that the current decision can indeed be understood in such a way that the involvement of Expando is set as a prerequisite for the awarding of Sustentation. In this way a Church Council is prescribed as to how their ministry should be organized.
2.4.3 Aanbeveling Beswaargrond 3 slaag.	2.4.3 Recommendation Ground for objection 3 succeeds.
Besluit: Punte 2.1 tot 2.4.3 kennis geneem.	**Decision: Points 2.1 to 2.4.3 noted.**
3. Sake waaroor die Sinode besluit	**3. Matters that Synod decides on**
3.1 *Finale bevinding*	3.1 *Final finding*
3.1.1 Beswaargrond 1 en 3 slaag. **Besluit: Goedgekeur.**	3.1.1 Grounds for objection 1 and 3 succeed. **Decision: Approved.**
3.1.2 Beswaargrond 2 slaag nie. **Besluit: Goedgekeur.**	3.1.2 Ground for objection 2 does not succeed. **Decision: Approved.**
3.1.3 Die beswaar slaag in geheel. **Besluit: Goedgekeur.**	3.1.3 The Gravamen as a whole succeeds. **Decision: Approved.**