

CHRISTIAN SCHOLARSHIP FOR RECONCILIATION?

A Comparative analysis of two historical models of faith - full scholarship: The Free University of Amsterdam and Potchefstroom University for Christian Higher Education, 1975 -1995.

In: Van Vugt, William E & Cloete, G. Daan (eds.) RACE, ETHNICITY AND RECONCILIATION IN SOUTH AFRICA: A MULTICULTURAL COMPARATIVE DIALOGUE. London: Lexington Books, 2000

**Prof. Dr. M. Elaine Botha
Emeritus Professor of Philosophy,
PU for CHE, Potchefstroom.
Professor of Philosophy,
Redeemer College, Ontario.**

COMMON ROOTS - DIFFERENT FRUITS?

"Although the P.U. and F.U. have basic principles in common, it became evident earlier that, in the application of these principles, fundamental differences in viewpoints arise between our universities regarding the task and function of a Christian university" (Free University. 1975).

This quote succinctly formulates the question central to this paper. How do these viewpoints differ and how did these differences come about? How does reconciliation fit into these differing viewpoints concerning the task and function of a Christian university? One could argue that the presence of institutions for Christian Higher education in war torn, or strife ridden countries or countries inhabited by peoples with apparently irreconcilable historical conflicts ought to be one that not only signifies reconciliation but also actively contributes to the actual processes of reconciliation between groups. The judgement whether this is feasible and actually the case depends on the definition of the task of the university and higher education in general, the conception of its relationship to society and societal conflict. It also depends on what is regarded as "reconciliation" in a specific concrete situation. The definition of these variables determines to what extent their functioning in specific cultural situations is actually comparable.

The theme of this book and the Conference that gave rise to it, has clearly defined the parameters of what is understood under "reconciliation". The theme of this chapter deals with the question whether the two models of

Christian scholarship pursued by the two institutions actually contributed to societal reconciliation - reconciliation within racial and ethnic tensions as they have become apparent in South Africa. This narrows the focus of reconciliation to a societal and political focus, which in turn shapes the question whether a university as academic community can or ought to in any way contribute to or become involved in the resolution of such tension. Moreover the scope of reconciliation is much wider than this narrow socio political focus. But it does beg the question concerning the relationship between the academy, scholarship, teaching, education and reconciliation. This in turn entails answers to questions such as: What is the nature of a university? What is the nature of academic scholarship? How does this internal and intrinsic task of the university relate to external societal and political situations and forces? Only when these issues have been clarified can questions such as the contribution of the Free University of Amsterdam in the Netherlands and the Potchefstroom University for Christian Higher Education in Potchefstroom, South Africa to the resolution of racial and ethnic tension and conflict be pursued. Pivotal to these questions is the self-understanding of the identity and vision of these two institutions. The puzzling question why the ideal of Christian scholarship changed so fundamentally over time and became so diluted in the case of both institutions, remains open to diverse interpretations. Two hypotheses could be explored: The Free University was never actually able to overcome its positivist legacy and instrumental view of science and ultimately chose for religious commitment via social engagement and service to the policies of the World Council of Churches. Potchefstroom University never fully overcame the intrinsic dualism of the "christian national" ideals of its founders. "Christian" was interpreted in the Calvinistic sense of the word, but the domain of the "national" life always seemed to have remained an autonomous (neutral?) area claimed only by the people, nation or state.

In both cases a mediating notion between Scripture and the knowledge of the world, that of the "reformed principles" or the Christian-historical principles were postulated. The way they were understood contributed to either the disillusionment with the feasibility of Christian scholarship or led to an insufficiently radical reformation of scholarship. Yet, the postulation of "reformed principles" revealed an understanding that the influence and role of Scripture and the knowledge of God's revelation in creation was mediated by a "view" or "perspective" of some kind. This notion was later articulated in the tradition of Reformational philosophy which argued that the relevance of Scripture to scholarship becomes apparent via the mediation of a theoretically articulated world view, i.e. a philosophy. Both approaches in which some form of "reformed principles" were postulated approximated this understanding, but were inadequate. Moreover in both cases the pursuit of these Christian-historical principles

derailed the quest for a Christian academic witness that could contribute to actual societal and political reconciliation. This became manifest not only in the implicit understanding of the relationship between the university and society but also in its intrinsic understanding of the nature of scholarship. In the final instance I would like to argue that the intrinsic calling of the academy is to demonstrate its Christian commitment to the poor and guilt-laden by bringing about justice-in-shalom through the typical structural task of the university: the academic endeavour, i.e. education, teaching and research. Only a university able to produce, explore and teach "...theories pregnant with shalom" (Seerveld, 1978) can actually contribute to reconciliation. Whether this is accomplished is very closely related to its understanding of self identity.

Academic self-identity

Both the Free University of Amsterdam and the Potchefstroom university for Christian Higher Education in South Africa, stem from a rich Reformed and Calvinistic legacy which confesses the integrality of faith and action. Both institutions claim to represent an understanding of the Gospel which is world embracing and world affirmative¹. In the history of both institutions there was a conscious and deliberate move away from dualistic or pietistic understandings of Christian presence in society. The Free University developed along the general lines of Reformed Calvinism and consciously shied away from the pietism of the Reville. Potchefstroom University developed from the embryonic beginnings of a Theological Seminary for the *Gereformeerde Kerk* which historically broke away from the *Nederduitse Gereformeerde kerk (NGK)* in South Africa because of the pietism and purported Arminianism of the NGK. So both institutions shared an understanding of the nature of creation, sin, redemption and grace which entailed that higher education and scholarship requires the recognition and embodiment of the claim of the Lordship of Jesus Christ over all aspects of human life. It stands to reason that even though these two institutions shared historical and to some extent even cultural roots, their self understanding and articulation of identity evolved differently. So did their respective implementation of fundamental notions concerning the nature of Christian scholarship and the relationship of school to society.

Notions of academic self understanding and identity are central to a university's conception of its task and role as academic institution and its role in society. Not only was Holland and South Africa very different breeding grounds for Christianity and for the development of education and scholarship in the late nineteenth century, but a fundamental shift in their respective understanding and articulation of self identity took place which influenced their positioning towards societal issues of racial conflict, ethnic tension and reconciliation. In both cases this self

understanding was closely related to philosophical and ideological shifts in the surrounding culture and specifically in reformulations of the nature of Christian witness amidst societal tensions. But the shifts were also mediated by their typical understanding of the nature of scientific endeavour. The test case for their respective views on reconciliation was the question of the relationship of the academy to the South African political system of apartheid. This came to a head in the late sixties and early seventies and culminated in a parting of ways at the international Conference in Christian Higher Education held at Potchefstroom in 1975.

I have deliberately restricted this comparative analysis to the period between 1975 - 1995. The reason for this is quite simple. In 1975 an International Conference on Christian Higher Education took place at Potchefstroom which could be seen as a historical watershed in the relationship between the two institutions, but it also represents a watershed in their respective self understandings as institutions of Christian higher learning. Before we take a closer look at this historical watershed some reflections on the relationship between academia and politics are called for.

NO POLITICALLY OR RELIGIOUSLY NEUTRAL UNIVERSITYⁱⁱ

It is the confession of a dominant strand in the Reformed tradition in higher learning that no single dimension of human life can be seen as religiously neutral. This tradition argues that this claim holds as much for the nature of theorizingⁱⁱⁱ and scholarship as it does for the nature of education and societal structures.^{iv} This in turn entails that in the interrelationship of the university and politics there is no possibility of arguing for a politically neutral university. This does not imply that there are no boundaries between politics and the university or that these boundaries are not normative. But it does imply that a university always implicitly or explicitly positions itself towards the political system or practice within which it is placed.

In the literature that deals with the interrelationship of academia and politics two positions are juxtaposed: On the one hand the notion of the neutral or a-political university. On the other hand the recognition of the inevitable political involvement of the university. The following quote from Wallerstein (1969:11) points to the latter position:

"It is a political act for the university to support the government in its normal functions. It is a political act for the university to be indifferent to the government. It is a political act for the university to oppose the government. However it acts in its relation to the government, the university is engaged in politics".

Juxtaposed to this position is that of Philip M. Hauser (1975:270) who argues that the university is essentially a-

political and called to fulfil an unique a-political task. Hauser develops his position in conjunction with the Weberian thesis concerning the value-neutrality of scholarship. This does not exclude the possibility that students and faculty members can participate in active politics or in advisory political roles in their capacity as citizens, but within the context of the university itself the student or faculty member is called to be a "political eunuch".^v

These positions warrant discussion, but within the context of this paper it is the tacit political involvement of the university which requires illumination. The so-called apolitical character of the university becomes highly questionable when it appears that the university uncritically actively or tacitly supports a questionable political policy that sustains its own existence. I would like to argue that a university as an institution of higher learning can as little escape making choices concerning politics as it can escape its inevitable religious or confessional choices. These choices are obviously made in the process of fulfilling its typical task, i.e. scholarship, research and teaching, e.g. the "relevance" of university curricula.^{vi} But the point being made here is the fact that institutions of higher learning need to make their positions vis-a-vis political systems and ideologies within which they are called to operate explicit. The unmasking of the idols and idolatry of the surrounding society is part of the intrinsic task of scholarship and teaching. This brings us to the question to what extent these two institutions accomplished this.

THE FREE UNIVERSITY: AGENT FOR SOCIETAL RECONCILIATION?

- The elusive "Reformed principles"

Both the Free University of Amsterdam and the so called "Vereniging voor Wetenschappelijke Onderwijs op Gereformeerde Grondslag" ("The Association for Scientific Education on Reformed basis") date from the turbulent and creative seventies of the nineteenth century. These were times in the Netherlands during which Christian organizations and institutions were spawned in practically every aspect of Dutch culture, in education, politics, journalism, culture and in social issues: The Dutch Calvinist newspaper *De Standaard* (1872), the establishment of *Patrimonium* (1878), the establishment of national electoral associations for the *Anti Revolutionary Party*, all kinds of movements in the area of Christian education all came into existence during this period of time. It was a time that heralded the development of manifold organizations in which the age old struggle of faith and unbelief came to a new and more pronounced expression. The founders of the Free University of Amsterdam established in 1880, were convinced that it was the task of the university to disclose a view of the world and of humankind based on the message of the Gospel. Obviously the establishment of the Free University can not be isolated from the historical

ecclesiastical developments in the Netherlands of the late nineteenth century.

Prior to this event the Netherlands had its first Christian university established in Leiden in 1575. As the nature of Dutch society secularised, the relationship between the university of Leiden and church and religion became eroded. These trends also characterized other Dutch universities who were influenced by the spirit of rationalism and empiricism. It was the religious renaissance of the nineteenth century in Holland and the ecclesiastical developments in the circle of the Dutch Reformed Churches during that time that formed the cultural background to the establishment of the Association that brought the Free University into existence. It availed itself of the opportunity created by the "Wet op hoger onderwijs" (Law on Higher Education) of 1876 which formally made it possible to establish universities on the basis of special religious considerations^{vii}. The Reformed Christian founders of the Free University of Amsterdam believed that the spirit of the age with its theological liberalism and state absolutism needed to be countered by an act of faith which would point to the freedom of humankind to serve God and the freedom from all state prescription in academic education. They were convinced that the Biblical message would be mediated via the uncovering of the creational ordinances ("gereformeerde beginselen" - literally 'reformed principles') or structures and this message would then be relayed via the academic endeavour to a world in which the signs of chaos and relativism are ever present.^{viii} They regarded the academic search on the basis of their faith for these qualitatively differentiated creational structures as the primary task of the university. This task came to expression in their formulation of the well known Kuiperian principle of "sphere sovereignty". These principles would provide guidelines for personal and societal action and behaviour.^{ix} They would also provide the bridge to the renewal of society. They were also the key to the resolution of the question at the heart of Christian scholarship: What is the internal relationship between God's Word and the various areas of academic endeavour?^x The seemingly elusive nature of these "principles"^{xi} is one of the many factors that gradually leads to a radical rethinking of the articulation of the confessional basis of the Free University. A brief historical note about the origin and evolution of this notion is called for.

The notion of "reformed principles" ("gereformeerde beginselen") are invoked by Kuiper as an explanation/mechanism/articulation of the way the university and scholarship is related and bound to God's revelation in Scripture and in nature.^{xii} Kuiper's grounds for this claim is a reference to article 2 of the *Netherlands Confession of Faith* which bases the knowledge of God on two means: His creation (described by the well known "Book" metaphor) and Scripture. The potentially diverse interpretations of Scripture would be laid to rest when the

Reformed principles were chosen as common frame of reference. These Reformed principles would function as hermeneutical key to the articulation of the understanding of Scripture concerning humankind, world and society. They would function both as the distinguishing traits or identity of the Free University and the spiritually unifying factors in the coherence of presuppositions required by both research and teaching.^{xiii} Kuyper's complicated view of the place of Scripture in the Reformed principles gave rise to a certain tension. Scripture had two purposes Kuyper argued. The first is the disclosure of the way of reconciliation. This happens primarily through the church and as such relates only indirectly to the academy. Scripture also enables us to understand the book of "Nature" which is the domain of science.^{xiv} It is this historical view of the relationship between the "reformed principles" and the "identity" of the Free university of Amsterdam which is called into question by developments in the early sixties and seventies. The "reformed principles" were to form the basis ("grondslag") of the pursuit of research, scholarship and teaching at the Free University. Operating in this fashion the university was called to oppose the threats of naturalism and contribute to the re-christianisation of culture and the conservation of orthodoxy.^{xv}

The enigmatic question as to what these reformed principles actually were, surfaces in every commemoration of the history of the Free University.^{xvi} It seemed to have been a bone of contention from the very beginning^{xvii}. The emphases in the articulation of the nature of the principles vary from time to time: At times "Christian" and "Reformed" (principles) are equated, at other times the emphasis is on the *Calvinistic* nature of the Christian principles (in contrast to general Christian or Protestant). Fabius on the other hand interprets these principles as par excellence the "national" or historical Calvinism referring to the lifestyle developed in Holland during the course of the 16th and 17th century.^{xviii}

It surfaces in the differences concerning the nature of these principles in the conflict between Kuyper and De Saponin Lehman in the period immediately before Lehman is required to leave the Free University in 1896. The fundamental issue at stake was the question whether these principles could be identified and were of such a nature that their historical appearance would provide a system for diverse facets of Reformed life. De Saponin Lehman did not think this was the case, moreover believed that facts were facts and did not differ when they were being seen by a Reformed perspective^{xix}. By 1927 a special committee appointed by the directors and curators of the Free University came to the conclusion that these principles had not yet been found!^{xx} Van Deursen's^{xxi} analysis of the mirror image of the Free University represented in four publications dealing with its' history shows that the expectation that these principles would be realized and concretely worked out, was a matter of faith and prayer. When they were eventually embodied in the philosophical system of Herman Dooyeweerd and D.Th Vollenhoven, it is seen as an answer to prayer^{xxii}. Roelink^{xxiii} on the other hand states:

"But, now concerning the principle ([*beginsel*]). This word has stood as an wicked fairy at the cradle of the

Association and the Free University established by the Association and have accompanied both through a whole century....vexatiously accompanied both until today".

The historians of the Free University emphasize the close relationship between the academy and the reformed community supporting the work of the Free university in the course of these historical developments. This community was historically bound to and guided by these same reformed principles as the Free University was.

The elaboration of these reformed principles in the Philosophy of Herman Dooyeweerd requires a passing comment. Where Kuyper and the founders of the Free University saw the encyclopaedia of the disciplines develop from the embryonic cells of a Christian world view Dooyeweerd and Vollenhoven clearly distinguished between "structure" and "direction".^{xxiv} This entailed the recognition that science and the university as societal structure have their own structural principles or laws which characterize their existence and that the influence of faith and world view comes to expression in the direction in which these structures are given concrete shape and form. The knowledge of the disciplines are not inferred from or developed out of kernels already contained in the reformed principles.^{xxv}

In the sixties and seventies a growing sense of dis- ease is experienced by the academic staff of the Free University. The university had developed to encompass all the traditional university faculties with the consequence that more and more teaching faculty had to be appointed who were not comfortable with or not in agreement with the basis and principles of the Free University or who simply lacked adequate training in and exposure to the reformed tradition. Within the university a growing pluriformity of protestant orthodoxy was occurring which was making it more difficult to accomplish the development of a university on a broad reformed basis. A number of other factors contributed to the fact that the Free University chose a new route to relate religious commitment to the surrounding culture: Internal disillusionment with the purported elusive character of the "reformed principles" on which to base scholarship and teaching, a gradual dilution of the originally required confessional commitment of academics, a growing sense of the need of ecumenism in the face of growing confessional pluralism and a new (political) understanding of the calling of the university midst the brokenness and suffering of society. In 1971 these developments come to a climax in the replacement of the "reformed principles" with a differently formulated goal ("doelstelling")^{xxvi} which was to articulate that Biblical revelation has meaning giving significance for humankind and for society.^{xxvii} The changes in the basis of the Free University represented a definite move towards an

instrumentalist view of science in the service of evangelical goals and purposes.^{xxviii}

In Van Deursen's^{xxix} analysis of four publications commemorating different historical phases of the Free University, he points out that two recurring issues surface: The reformed principles and the relationship to the reformed community ("achterban"). The common denominator between these two issues was the fact that they were radically opposed to plurality or pluriformity. And yet, plurality is exactly what the change in the articulation of the basis of the Free University accomplishes and recognizes. When the content of what this change entails is unpacked it becomes apparent that Christian commitment needs to relate to poverty, injustice, racial tension, suffering, anxiety, war, guilt environmental issues and death.^{xxx} Does this represent a fundamental shift in the Free University's understanding of the range and implications of faith? This is a difficult question to answer. Undoubtedly the shift in emphasis from the reformed principles to the relevance of scholarship and the academy to concrete societal issues represents a new approach. The world formative claims of the reformed principles have been replaced by an emphasis on engagement in concrete issues of reconciliation. A major shift in the policies of the Free University takes place in 1993 when the management of the Free University ceases to require that faculty and staff applying for positions at the university, formally agree with the Christian goals of the university^{xxxi}

The establishment of a Steering Group with the mandate to investigate values and norms in the Free University teaching and research process in 1993 marks another important phase in the development of the university's understanding of Christian scholarship. The goal of this project was formulated as follows:

The education of students to become academics that will function in a responsible way in society, who will apply their academic knowledge within the context of broader knowledge of society and conscious of values (in the sense of life views and human rights) that play an implicit role. This would entail making these values explicit and testing these values" (Free translation)^{xxxii}

Because teaching is a culturally determined activity it is a value-laden form of communication. Teaching and scholarship assume that there is a common commitment to search for truth. Central to this project is the training and education of students for responsible decision making. The Final report does not give a very optimistic picture. Professors in many of the faculties were unsure as to the way in which these values were to be embodied in their disciplines and teaching. Others felt they did not have adequate time and resources to devote to these matters. Some were not very enamoured with the idea that there would be some external intervention or involvement in their discussions about values in their disciplines^{xxxiii}. In an interview with prof. E. Boeker it becomes clear that the idea of service to society and the implementation of values in this process is quite clear, but a discussion about the notion

of "serving God" he claims is not fruitful discussion within the context of the task of a university. These developments are self evident. They constitute a clear shift from the initial idea of the Reformed principles, certainly make "reconciliation" as value to pursue possible, but have emptied the notion of Christian content. More needs to be said about this. Certainly an argument on the basis of what Caper would have called "common grace" is required here, but this will have to suffice for now.

The development of the Free University's understanding of reconciliation is a litmus test of its sensitivity to theological, philosophical, cultural and political changes in its surrounding culture. Philosophical movements such as neo-Marxism and later post-modernism also influenced these changes profoundly. The test case in which these views concerning reconciliation were to be tried and tested was the relationship to a reformed university shaped in the crucible of the same historical tradition, the Potchefstroom University for Christian Higher Education in South Africa.

POTCHEFSTROOM UNIVERSITY FOR CHRISTIAN HIGHER EDUCATION: AGENT FOR SOCIETAL RECONCILIATION?

Perhaps the most intriguing question concerning the role of Potchefstroom University is the question why this institution which so courageously positioned itself in the struggle against neutrality in scholarship and education and for the propagation of the Lordship of Jesus Christ in all areas of life did not in a similar fashion speak out prophetically and critically against the obvious injustice of the South African apartheid system. Potchefstroom always had so called "dissenting voices", who were willing to take a stand against the discrimination and injustice of the political system, but the question here is why the university as institution did not speak out against or oppose government policies that clearly contravened the most basic message of the Gospel. Perhaps even more dubitable is the fact that the philosophical and theological justification of apartheid was hardly questioned by generations of academics and students at Potchefstroom university. One of the most well known academic defenders of racial segregation was the Potchefstroom Calvinistic philosopher, H.G. Stoker. What is especially puzzling is the fact that he was a ardent defender of the postulate that all knowledge is fundamentally determined by religious convictions. He introduced and elaborated Dutch neo-Calvinism, the philosophy of Herman Dooyeweerd to South Africa. Although he was an avid opponent of the neutrality postulate in scholarship and science, he was not consistent in drawing the consequences of these convictions through to national and political life. Perhaps this is not a fair statement. His application of Calvinistic convictions to issues of culture, nationality and politics led him to argue

that separate development as political system was justified. His philosophical defence of apartheid and his views on the nature of Christian scholarship were influential in the shaping of the policies and educational practices of Potchefstroom university.

Potchefstroom University's interpretation of its "christian" character in the course of its history strongly reflected the dominant political-ideological views of the surrounding culture. These views, strengthened by Stoker's views on the nature of the university, scholarship and academic freedom contributed to the university's lack of prophetic-critical distance to the dominant political system. The history of Potchefstroom university as that of most other universities, clearly show a correlation between the changes in the historical, political and cultural situation and its views concerning its identity and self understanding and specifically its interpretation of what the notion of "christian" actually implies. When British imperialism is the enemy of most Afrikaans language universities in South Africa, Potchefstroom university's understanding of "Christian" is deeply coloured by Afrikaner nationalistic and cultural overtones. When the struggle focuses on the exemption from the so called "conscience clause"^{xxxiv} which prohibits enquiry concerning the religious convictions of professors and the struggle for independence it is these focal points which colour the way in which the "Christian" character is understood. The early seventies confronted Potchefstroom with a new challenge, one which would once again force the university to rethink its interpretation of its mission. This came to a head in the relationship when the Free University of Amsterdam and other kindred universities pose the critical question concerning the socio-critical task of the university within the context of a discriminatory political system. Later developments under the influence of post-modernism and more specifically the radical political shift in South Africa with its challenges of multiculturalism and reconstruction have posed a whole new set of questions which require Christian reflection. Because of the role of the Calvinistic philosopher H.G. Stoker in moulding the identity and self understanding of Potchefstroom university I would like to highlight some aspects of his views.

H.G. STOKER: ACADEMIC FREEDOM, UNIVERSITY FREEDOM AND APARTHEID

In Stoker's ceaseless struggle to establish Christian scholarship a strong prophetic-critical dimension was ever present. His magisterial contribution to the academy was the constant emphasis on the radically religious determination of knowledge and thought. This certainly made him one of the strongest crusaders for the recognition of Potchefstroom university as an independent university with a unique calling. Although Stoker wrote much on the

struggle of Potchefstroom university to be recognized as a Christian university, one does not find many publications in which he explicitly deals with the relationship between the university and the wider society. As many of his contemporaries Stoker was deeply rooted in the cultural struggle of the existence of the Afrikaner people a fact that obviously made him less critical of the political system of apartheid which was the outcome of a fierce struggle for the recognition of the cultural and racial identity of the Afrikaners and all other groups destined to share a common territory in South Africa.

To the question whether racial segregation in any way diminishes academic freedom Stoker declares^{xxxv}

"..I give my personal view, which is, as far as I can see, fundamentally in agreement with the South African Government's policy of apartheid".

The article is devoted to the question whether the prohibition of "Bantu students" at White or European universities could be seen to be in contravention of academic freedom. In the thesis of his response to this question he operates with the contrast between "European" and "Bantu" racial groups. But the term "racial" is consistently followed by (resp. national)

He^{xxxvi} argues that apartheid emphasizes the relationship between human societal groups and that it accepts the primary principle of the universal equality and freedom of all human beings "...primarily in respect of racial groups". Racial groups, he claims have their own individuality and life style and apartheid wants to protect all races in order to elevate them to their highest level of development according to their own "nature". When this has taken place, existing discriminatory measures ought to be abolished.^{xxxvii}

The unfortunate fact that many of the Bantu race have already reached such a level of development, he claims is an "...unhappy victims of a transitional phase of Bantu development".^{xxxviii} This "puberty phase" he says requires adjustments from both the "parent" and the "child". This racial crisis has been brought about by the acceleration of economic integration of the urban Bantu and Europeans. This is a crisis which will force South Africa to make a choice between integration and differentiation. There is no middle ground between apartheid and integration, because integration inevitably leads to assimilation^{xxxix}.

In his attempt to answer the question concerning academic freedom, Stoker introduces the distinction between "academic" freedom and "university" freedom. The former is intrinsic to the university, the latter relates to the way the university ought to be free to serve its own racial group. He says:

"...the ideal of a policy of integration, namely that a university should not serve only a section of the country, but that it should have a multiracial character, and be a cross-section of the racial composition of South Africa, appears to be unacceptable".^{xi}

He summarizes his own position by concluding that the South African government has a good case for the establishment of separate "non-European" universities. When he discusses the important question whether the prohibition of Bantu students to European universities might not be a transgression of university freedom, he argues that the criterion for access to European universities should be the question whether a number of conditions have been met. Some of these conditions are: has the pattern of apartheid been realized, has the danger of integration and assimilation been thwarted and has the national or racial character of the university been protected. He reproaches the so called "open" universities for the fact that their entry requirements are not based on "academic grounds" but on the pre-theoretical principles of "liberalism"^{xii} Once the pattern of racial differentiation has been established and the Bantu people have reached a certain level of development he sees no objection to

i.

Brinkman, Harry. Identiteit van de Vrije Universiteit. Beschouwingen bij de opening van de cursus 1992 - 1993 aan de Vrije Universiteit. p. 7. Amsterdam. Vrije Universiteit. Cf. also Botha, M. Elaine. Christelike universiteit en politiek in 'n apartheid- en post apartheid bedeling. **Koers**.1994.....

ii.Botha, M. Elaine. School in Society. In: **Justice in the International Economic Order. The Responsibility of Christian Institutions of Higher Education to** . 1978. Grand Rapids. CRC Publications.43 - 66.

iii.Clouser, Roy A. 1991. **The myth of religious neutrality. An essay on the hidden role of religious belief in theories.** Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press.

iv.It is not clear whether this line of argument is shared by Harry Brinkman (**Identiteit van de Vrije Universiteit, 1992**) who claims in his rendering of one of the many "small narratives" about the university that universities do not (can not?) have goals ("doelstellingen") in the same fashion that an individual has goals. Probably his claim is the negation of the "religious commitment" of

societal structures such as universities. Whether this also entails the rejection of the idea of a (God given) structure is not clear from this article.

v. Hauser, Philip M. Political actionism in the university. **Daedalus**, 104, Winter. 1975: 265-272.

vi. Wallerstein, I. **University in turmoil: The Politics of Change**. New York. 1969. p.145.

vii. Roelink, J. Een Blinkend Spoor, 1879 - 1979, p.10.

viii. Verhoogt, J.P., Griffioen, S and Fernhout, R. (eds.) **Vinden en Zoeken. Het bijzondere van de Vrije Universiteit**. Kampen: Kok. 1997.

ix. Verhoogt, et al. **Vinden en Zoeken**. p.4

x. Cf. Van Dijk, A.J. Wetenschap en Beginsel. In: *Beweging*, 79. 43, #2, April 1979, p.31.

xi. Wieringa, W.J. D Vrije Universiteit als bijzondere instelling. In: **Wetenschap en rekenschap, 1880 - 1980. Een eeuw wetenschapsbeoefening en wetenschapsbeshouwing aan de Vrije Universiteit**. Kok. Kampen. 1980, 11- 43. Cf. also Van Deursen, A.Th. De Vrije Universiteit in eigen spiegel. In: Verhoogt, J.P., Griffioen, S. and Fernhout, R. (eds.) **Vinden en zoeken: het bijzondere van de Vrije Universiteit**. Kok. Kampen. 1997.

xii. Kuyper, Abraham. 1899. **Band aan het woord. Antwoord op de vraag 'Hoe is eene Universiteit aan het woord van God te binden?** Amsterdam: Hoveker en Wormser. Cf. also: Fernhout, R. Hoe is een universiteit aan het Woord van God te binden? Kuypers antwoord en de huidige situatie aan de Vrije Universiteit. In. Verhoogt, J.P., Griffioen, S. and Fernhout, R. (eds.) **Vinden en zoeken**. Het bijzondere van de Vrije Universiteit. Kampen. Kok, p. 9.

xiii. Kuyper, Abraham. 1900. **Scholastica II. Om het zoeken of om het vinden? of Het doel van echte studie**. Amsterdam: Hoveker and Wormser.

xiv. Fernhout, R. Hoe is een christelijk universiteit aan het Woord van God te binden? p. 13.

xv. Wieringa, W.J. De Vrije Universiteit als bijzondere instelling - 1880 - 1980. In: **Wetenschap en Rekenschap, 1880 - 1980 Een eeuw**

wetenschapsbeoefening en wetenschapsbeschouwing aan de Vrije Universiteit. Kampen Kok. 1980.

xvi. Van Deursen, A. Th. *De Vrije universiteit in eigen spiegel*, p. 28,29. Cf. also Roelink, J. 1956. **Vijfenzeventig jaar Vrije Universiteit, 1880 - 1955. Gedenkboek bij het vijf en zeventig-jarig bestaan der Vrije Universiteit te Amsterdam.** Kampen. Kok. Roelink, J. **Een blinkend spoor, 1879 - 1979.**Kampen: Kok. 1979. 19,21.

xvii. J. Roelink, 1956. **Vijfenzeventig jaar Vrije Universiteit, 1880 - 1955. Gedenkboek bij het vijf en zeventig-jarig bestaan der Vrije Universiteit te Amsterdam.** Kampen. Kok. J. Roelink. **Een blinkend spoor, 1879 - 1979.**Kampen: Kok. 1979. 19,21.

xviii. Reference in: J. Roelink. *Een blinkend spoor, 1879 - 1979*, p. 17:

"... het Gereformeerde, het Calvinistische, of het bij uitnemendheid nationale".

xix. Roelink, J. 1956. **Vijfenzewentig jaar Vrije Universiteit, 1880 - 1955**, p.111.

xx. This so called "expressionist" understanding of the development of christian scholarship (i.e. the idea that science develops from certain "basic principles") proved historically inaccurate. (Brinkman, H.J. **Identiteit van de Vrije Universiteit.** Beschouwing van drs. H.J. Brinkman, voorzitter van het College van Bestuur, bij de opening van de cursus, 1992 - 1993 aan de Vrije Universiteit op 7 September 1992. Amsterdam: Vrije Universiteit.p.10; Wolterstorff, Nicholas. N. 1988. *The project of a Christian university in a Postmodern culture. Inaugural address Free University of Amsterdam*).

xxi. *De Vrije Universiteit in eigen spiegel*, p. 34,35.

xxii. Van Deursen, *Die Vrije Universiteit in eigen spiegel*, p.34 - 36.

xxiii. "Maar nu het beginsel. Dat woord heeft als een boze fee aan de wieg der Vereniging en de van haar uitgaande VU gestaan en beide een eeuw begeleid. Kwellend begeleid, tot vandaag toe".

J. Roelink. *Een blinkend spoor, 1879 - 1979*, p. 10.

xxiv.Griffon, Sander. Cultuuromslag aan de V.U. In: Verhoogt, J.P., Griffon, S. and Fernhout, R. (eds.) **Vinden en zoeken: het bijzondere van de Vrije Universiteit**. Kok: Kampen. 1997.p. 72.

xxv.Griffon, Sander. Cultuuromslag aan de V.U. p. 72

xxvi. Van Deursen, De Vrije Universiteit in eigen spiegel, p.38.

xxvii.Wiering, W.J. De Vrije Universiteit als bijzondere instelling, 1880 -1980. In: Wetenschap en rekenschap, 1880 - 1980. Een eeuw wetenschapsboefening aan de Vrije Universiteit. Kampen. Kok. 1980. p. 43. Cf. also Brinkman, Harry, 1992. Identiteit van de Vrije Universiteit. Amsterdam. Vrije Universiteit. p. 3.

xxviii.Van Dick, A. 1979. Wetenschap en Beginsel. **Beweging 79**, (43)2, April 1979.p. 28 -36.

xxix.De Vrije Universiteit in eigen spiegel. p. 41

xxx.Brinkman, Harry. 1992.p. 7.

xxxi.Zuidweg, Martine. Faculteiten worstelen met doelstelling. **Ad Valvas**, 21 Maart 1996.p. 5

xxxii.Boschhuizen, R. and Goudzwaard, B.1995. **Van Waarden Weten. De plaats van waarden in het VU-onderwijs**. Amsterdam. Vrije Universiteit.p. 6

xxxiii. Boschhuizen and Goudzwaard. Van Waarden weten p. 36 -38. Cf. also Zuidweg, Martine. Faculteiten worstel met doelstelling.p. 5

xxxiv. Clause 25 of law no. 12 of 1916. See: Reinecke, C.J. 1989. Rektorale inhuldigingsrede: Die PU vir CHO: Verankerend in sy beginsels en gerig op die toekoms. **Koers**. 54(4), 415 -431.

xxxv.Stoker, H.G.1967."At the crossroads: Apartheid and University Freedom in South Africa" (originally published in 1957). Oorsprong en Rigting, vol. I.Cape Town. Tafelberg Publishers. p. 210, 211.

xxxvi. Stoker, H.G.1967."At the crossroads: Apartheid and

University Freedom in South Africa" p. 213.

xxxvii. Stoker, H.G.1967."At the crossroads: Apartheid and University Freedom in South Africa" p. 213.

xxxviii. Stoker, H.G.1967."At the crossroads: Apartheid and University Freedom in South Africa" p. 214.

xxxix. Stoker, H.G.1967."At the crossroads: Apartheid and University Freedom in South Africa" p. 216.

xl. Stoker, H.G.1967."At the crossroads: Apartheid and University Freedom in South Africa" p. 218.

xli. Stoker, H.G.1967."At the crossroads: Apartheid and University Freedom in South Africa" p. 221,