INDICATION OF CHANGES

Land Dispossession as ‘Original Sin.’ Can Christian Original Sin talk be Used as Diagnostic Tool within the Public Domain?

Dear editor,

Reviewers A and B suggested a number of changes to my essay. The suggestions were helpful and I tried to incorporate them as follows:

REVIEWER A

1. Reviewer A firstly suggested that I integrate the various sections to a larger degree by aligning them to the major theme of the article i.e the use of original sin talk in public debates about land reform.

*I added sentences to sections 3 (pg 7 and 9), 4 (pg 11) and 5 (p 16). The other sections relate directly to the land question.*

1. The reviewer requested that I indicate how my proposed application of original sin talk to the land debate could contribute to Christian theology itself.

*The issue was discussed on p 13-14. I added a paragraph to the conclusion to drive the point home.*

1. I was encouraged to reconsider the last paragraph of THE‘RISKS’ OF TRANSPOSING ‘ORIGINAL SIN’ TALK TO THE PUBLIC DOMAIN on page 8-9 because it seems to be self-contradictory. The reviewer gave a number of reasons why he or she does not find it persuasive.

*I decided to omit the particular passage. The point I was trying to make is simply that collective notions of guilt – when applied within a criminal justice system - could easily lead to arbitrary justice. I concede, though, that the passage’s application of the relevant juridical principle to the land debate may be wrongly construed by some as a subtle attempt to deny justice to those who had been affected by land grabs.*

1. Lastly, the reviewer challenge me to articulate clearer what the potentially constructive contribution of theological discourse about original sin could be to the public debate about land reform and the need to address historical injustices.

*I added a paragraph to the conclusion that addresses the issue.*

REVIEWER B

Reviewer B suggested that I add references (e.g. in the introduction) to the project on "Redeeming sin?", to the various colloquia that were hosted and to some of the contributions on original sin that were published from previous colloquia.

1. *I included a few sentences on pg 2-3 that relates the essay to the theme of the project.*
2. *I’ve added an endnote that mentions important contributions by project participants on the topic of original sin.*
3. *I’ve added a paragraph at endnote 16 on the main trajectories in sin talk with references to the book of Conradie (2017) and Van der Kooi & Van den Brink (2017).*
4. *I’ve inserted a paragraph on Conradie’s argument regarding the inevitability of ‘fall’ logic, but also the importance of not conflating original sin doctrine with discourses on the origin of evil (pg 15).*
5. *I’ve quoted Conradie on pg 20 with regard to the universality of sinning not implying an equality in sinning.*

I thank the reviewers for their constructive comments and trust that the changes will do justice to their comments.

Nico Vorster

21 April 2020.