

CHAPTER SEVEN  
**EPILOGUE: 1940-1980**

***Internment May 10, 1940***

In 1939, World War II broke out in Europe. Its impact was not immediately evident in the Dutch Indies in general and in the Batak area in particular, because at that time the Netherlands was still neutral and was not as yet involved in the abyss of battle. Until the beginning of 1940, the European workers of the Batakmission were able to continue their work without incident even though the public and the Batak church members who followed these world developments closely began to be anxious. Moreover, the Batakmission along with the HKBP were still able to hold the General Synod meeting at the beginning of 1940 in order to revise several articles of the Church Order of 1930 within the framework of strengthening the HKBP's independence.

This situation could not continue for long without serious hindrances. On the early morning of May 10, 1940, German forces occupied the Netherlands. On that same day, the Dutch colonial government interned all German citizens resident in the Indies, including the Batakmission's German workers, as a retaliatory response. We shall not discuss the details and more specific reasons for the internment because these matters are not related to the main topic of our research. What is definite is that practically speaking, after having continued for almost 80 years in the Batak area the RMG/Batakmission's work there had come to a close.

***ZNB and BNZ***

After internment, there remained just three Batakmission missionaries, De Kleine, Rijkhoek and Karelse (all from the Netherlands) and a number of Dutch teachers who operated Dutch schools independently from the Mission (see Chapter Six, A.5.), but the trio was unable to continue the work of the Batakmission by themselves. Therefore, they sought help from the *Zendingsconsulaat* in Batavia requesting that a number of Dutch missionaries be sent to continue or

to take over the work of the Batakmission. While waiting for assistance and further developments, De Kleine was appointed acting *Voorzitter* (chairperson and not Ephorus) of the HKBP).<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> The appointment of De Kleine was made at the oral direction of Ephorus Verwiebe in the presence of local Dutch colonial officials. The use of the term *Voorzitter* as a substitute for Ephorus was done deliberately. In addition to following the pattern of organization in the Dutch Church, it was also intended to wipe out all traces or heritage of the German Church or its Mission in the HKBP. Afterwards, the indigenous HKBP workers used that term, in fact they wished to go much further, namely to remove the hymns of German origin from the *Buku Ende HKBP*, the HKBP hymn book (see B.S.G. Gramberg, "The Batak Church in Fiery Trials" (a working paper), p. 2.

**Fout! Bladwijzer niet gedefinieerd.**

After May 10, 1940, the Dutch government formed the *Commissie voor het Rechtsverkeer in Oorlogstijd* (CRO, Wartime Legal Affairs Commission) to manage affairs arising in the Dutch Indies as a result of World War II. The Commission directed the *Zendingsconsulaat* to assume the administration of activities and property of mission bodies which were members of the Oegstgeest group, namely those clustered in the *SZC* and also of other bodies, including the RMG. In order to carry out this assignment, the *Zendingsconsulaat* formed a special organization, the *Zendingsnoodbestuur* (ZNB, Emergency Mission Board). To manage or take-over the work and property of the RMG in the Batak area and Nias, the ZNB formed the *Batak-Nias Zending* (BNZ).<sup>2</sup>

Within a relatively brief period of time, the BNZ was present and at work in the Batak-land through a number of Dutch missionaries, teachers and doctors recruited from mission fields in Java and Bali. Particularly in the field of schooling, the BNZ was charged with the responsibility of administering 450 subsidized schools (*Volksscholen* and *Vervolgscholen*) and their teachers. For that purpose it formed a special body, *Algemeen Schoolbeheer* (ASB, General School Administration). Later, the BNZ took over the Sipoholon seminary and the Laguboti Trade School, too, based on the same reason, namely both received government subsidies and were property of the RMG/Batakmission. The Dutch schools (*HIS*, *MULO* and *Schakelschool*) were not taken over or made an issue because these were administered autonomously by the two school associations which were under the supervision of Dutch teachers so they were not considered as Dutch enemies. The approximately 200 *Volksscholen* and *Vervolgscholen* which were not subsidized were not claimed by the BNZ because it was known that these were the property of the HKBP congregations and were therefore HKBP concerns. The BNZ knew that the HKBP was a legal body or possessed

---

<sup>2</sup> The ZNB was formed after the May 10, 1940 event and began to function actively in July 1940, whereas the BNZ was formed officially on September 27, 1940 and was acknowledged legally by the colonial government through its decision of April 17, 1941, but it had functioned *de facto* since the end of May, 1940. See *Zendingsconsuls di Hindia Belanda, Hoeria Dohot Zending di Tano Batak* (1941), pp. 17ff., and *Verslag van het ZNB, May 10, 1940-March 8, 1942*, pp. 9 and 53.

## **Fout! Bladwijzer niet gedefinieerd.**

corporate status, so theoretically the BNZ had no intention of interfering in its organization or its ownership rights to non-subsidized schools unless asked to do so by the HKBP.

But the BNZ did not acknowledge the HKBP as the valid heir of all the RMG's work and property, including the subsidized schools. It also considered that if the subsidized schools were handed over to the HKBP, the latter would be unable to administer such a large number of schools without the government's or Mission Consulate's help through the ZNB/BNZ. The most fundamental reason for the BNZ's attitude towards the HKBP and its negative evaluation was that the BNZ was not ready to recognize the HKBP as an autonomous church organization "one-hundred per cent free".<sup>3</sup> This argument was based on tensions between the RMG/ Batakmission and a number of indigenous church workers who were advocates of autonomy but who continued to work in the HKBP because the RMG itself had not as yet recognized the full autonomy of the HKBP.

### ***The HKBP Reaction***

Of course, the HKBP was not ready to accept the presence, attitude, evaluation and action of the BNZ along with the Dutch mission institutions which were standing behind it. Those who had long desired the full independence of the HKBP were very pleased about the May 10, 1940 event because as a result the RMG was as good as dead in their opinion and they were freed from its control. Their spontaneous response to it was expressed by the Batak words, *Nunga mate amanta Kongsu Barmen* [Our Barmen/RMG Association father has died].<sup>4</sup> They hurriedly prepared a **Special Synod meeting** to proclaim their independence and full autonomy from the RMG. This was held on July 10-11, 1940. There they not only proclaimed their independence from the RMG,

---

<sup>3</sup> A group in the HKBP seeking full independence caused this slogan to be heard at the July 1940 Special Synod.

<sup>4</sup> See the report of a Dutch pastor/missionary of the BNZ (whom the RMG assumed to be B.W.G. Gramberg), "De grote Synode van de Batakkerk July 10-11, 1940".

**Fout! Bladwijzer niet gedefinieerd.**

but also from all guardianship or Mission 'imperialism', including that of the BNZ. In other words, the Synod became the vehicle and opportunity to express the nationality and autonomy of the HKBP, in fact of the Batak community in general, and to declare its rejection of all foreign interference and domination. That was the reason why the Synod rejected De Kleine's leadership, or the leadership of any other Dutch missionary, and instead elected a Batak leader, namely pastor Kassianus Sirait as *Voorzitter* (chairperson) and Archelaus Nainggolan, a teacher, as *Secretaris-Penningmeester* (secretary-treasurer). They only requested that the missionaries become colleagues or assistants to the Batak pastors.<sup>5</sup>

At the same time, the Synod rejected the presence of the BNZ chaired by Karelse and the BNZ's claim to the subsidized Batakmission schools. Moreover, some synod participants whom the BNZ and RMG personnel called "a radical group", laid HKBP claim to all RMG/ Batakmission property because they considered the HKBP to be the RMG's valid heir. They requested that the colonial government hand over the subsidized schools to the HKBP in agreement with the Batakmission's decision of 1936. If the government was not ready to do this, then it would be more desirable for the government to take them over or to administer them itself rather than to give them to the BNZ.

But the BNZ felt it had the authority from the Mission Consulate and the government, and also that it had responsibility for the future of the Batakmission Christian schools. Therefore it could not accept the HKPB attitude. On the one hand the BNZ saw that the subsidized schools were basically government property which had been entrusted to the Batakmission for administration; therefore the HKBP had no right to them. On the other hand, the BNZ did not want the

---

<sup>5</sup> K. Sirait, "Pangiboelan ni Bericht ni HKBP doeng 10 Mei 1940 - November 1941" [A Summary of HKBP Reports from May 10 1940 - November 1941], which was read at the HKBP General Synod Meeting of November 11-26, 1942; cf. J. Sihombing, *Sedjarah ni HKBP* [History of the HKBP], 1961, pp. 92ff. Sirait was narrowly elected over De Kleine by a voice vote and this fact was seen by the RMG as an indication that there were still many Mission supporters in the HKBP or those who aimed to have the Mission continue working in the Batak area.

### **Fout! Bladwijzer niet gedefinieerd.**

government to take over all the schools because that would result in the loss of the schools' Christian character. According to the BNZ's observation, the government did not wish to transfer the schools to the HKBP because it did not think that the Batak church was capable of administering them and because the government itself wanted to take over the schools. In view of all that, the BNZ requested that the government act consistently with its decision made through the CRO to hand over the schools to it as the one holding the mandate of the Mission Consulate and the ZNB in the Batak area.

The difference of opinion between the HKBP on the one side, and the BNZ, ZNB and Mission Consulate on the other side gave rise to long drawn-out tensions and misunderstandings. These misunderstandings became more complicated because the government itself lacked consistency in its decisions through the CRO mentioned above.

### ***Colonial Government Actions***

In order to understand the school system problems, we need to take a backward glance for a moment. As touched on in the previous chapter, at the HKBP 1936 Synod Meeting, the Batakmission, which also formed the leadership of the HKBP, took the decision to transfer all its subsidized Batak language schools to the HKBP. The Batakmission requested the colonial government's concurrence in this matter through its Department of Education and Religion (*DOE*), and its Director, A.D.A. de Kat Angelino had given his agreement in principle. But the decision was not realized at once because there were various administrative technical problems to be solved. In contrast, P.J.A. Idenburg, who succeeded De Kat Angelino as DOE Director, did not agree to continue the original program, namely transferring the schools to the HKBP. He proposed a new idea in which the schools would become *openbare scholen met christelijke grondslag* (public schools with Christian foundations) to be administered by a new foundation or special educational body which would have representation from both the government and Mission on its board. It would appear that Idenburg's thought was not something different from his idea to reform the

### **Fout! Bladwijzer niet gedefinieerd.**

whole educational system in the Dutch Indies. In his opinion that system was excessively western-oriented up until 1940, and at the same time it failed to encompass the needs of Indonesians, but continued to receive insufficient government support.

But the regional government (as *Binnenlands Bestuur's* apparatus) and the Batakmission along with the HKBP expressed objections to Idenburg's ideas as touching the Batakmission's subsidized schools. We can assume the reason for the regional government's rejection, namely the principle of religious neutrality which all government schools had followed thus far. If Christianity would be made the basis for some of the schools, this would bring about a great deal of confusion. However, the reason for the Batakmission and HKBP's rejection of Idenburg's proposal was the same as formerly: schools were important for the Church and Mission as a means for evangelism and the nurture of Christian character. In addition, it would be an impossibility for the government's schools to be based on Christianity.

Even though there were objections, Idenburg continued to defend the idea of effecting a fundamental *omzetting* or *conversie* (basic change or conversion) of the status of the schools. Therefore, in 1939, he promulgated guidelines for implementing the conversion. In it he outlined that all government elementary schools and subsidized private ones in the Batak region which until then had been administered by separate organizations (local governments, Protestant missions, especially the Batakmission, Roman Catholic mission, etc.) would hence-forth be administered by one educational body and would be subsidized by the government. As a result, there would no longer be competition among the various educational agencies.

This program had not been implemented before internment occurred on May 10, 1940. But the new DOE Director, P.A. Hoesein Djajadiningrat, who succeeded Idenburg on May 15, 1940, defended its spirit and guide for implementation. Shortly after Djajadiningrat's appointment, he sent a telegram to the Inspector for Indigenous Education directing that all Batakmission schools become government schools. In subsequent developments, the government, meaning the DOE, worked hard to implement "Idenburg's directive" in order for the quality of the Mission's schools

**Fout! Bladwijzer niet gedefinieerd.**

to be at the same level as those of the government.

The BNZ strongly objected to this attitude and decision of the government because in its view, that would only confuse the task entrusted to it to administer the former Batakmission schools. The BNZ appealed repeatedly to the government not to pursue the conversion idea, but instead to fully entrust the schools to it and grant freedom to the ZNB through the BNZ to continue to maintain the status of the schools as mission schools having a Christian character, and not as government schools.

After these different opinions between the HKBP, ZNB/BNZ and the government continued to be at crossed-purposes for a sufficiently long period of time, at last the parties were able to come to an agreement that the subsidized schools would continue to be administered by the BNZ and those not subsidized would continue to be administered by the HKBP. In other words, there was a return to the *status quo*. Thus while neither side was totally satisfied, the schools continued to maintain their Christian character, even though they had to be subjected to government regulations.

But, and this was the result of further agreement, the *status quo* would not be allowed to continue for a long time. The HKBP and BNZ must each form an independent association or Christian education body to administer respective schools of each so that these would be freed later from any ties with either Mission or Church.

For the BNZ, the agreement corresponded with its opinion that the school must be separated from the Church so that each school teacher would not need to do double duty as pastor/preacher in his congregation. However, the BNZ understood that such a situation might persist in small churches or newly founded congregations. But this could not be maintained continuously, especially in congregations which were already established.<sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>6</sup> In commenting on this in "The Batak Church", p. 4, Gramberg, one of the BNZ figures, wrote, "The school teacher is bound in duty primarily to the school. We ourselves will set the example as school supervisors to work for the upbuilding of the church."



## **Fout! Bladwijzer niet gedefinieerd.**

However, the agreement brought no cheer to the HKBP, primarily because of its resulting consequences, namely the severing of the teachers' ties of ministry to congregations by those teaching in subsidized schools. In the judgment of the HKBP leaders, since the decision was made in 1936 to transfer schools to the HKBP the teachers were no longer Mission teachers; they were rather teachers of the HKBP, meaning that they no longer served under the Mission, but were under the authority of the HKBP. But the BNZ refused to accept this line of argument, and continued to maintain its own position. As a consequence, many teachers of BNZ-administered and government-subsidized schools resigned their ministry to congregations (as had also happened earlier) a situation fraught with much difficulty for the HKBP. *Voorzitter* Sirait, expressed his thanks that not all teachers in schools administered by the BNZ left their congregational ministries, "indeed, most of them gave their whole might to lead congregations after the HKBP was truly independent".<sup>7</sup>

---

But it is not right to transfer a teacher who is doing well in the school because the church no longer appreciates him. It is unthinkable that a good teacher who can not play the organ should find it almost impossible to secure a place, simply because no church is willing to receive him. It is surely wrong that the women teachers should have difficulty in finding employment because they can not conduct church services ... Is a church really served if the teachers are compelled to work in the church under the threat of dismissal? ... The school teacher must not be freed too rapidly from the church, but in due course this must occur in an ever-increasing number of churches, although the combination of teacher-preacher will long continue in poor districts and as a relief measure for small churches. It remains, however, the task of a self-supporting church not to depend upon the school teachers, but to provide the churches with their own leaders."

<sup>7</sup> Sirait, *op. cit.*, p. 6. In this connection, Hutaaruk (*op. cit.*, p. 252) wrote: "*Diese Meinungsverschiedenheiten der einheitlichen Lehrer weisen auf die Schwäche der HKBP als eine unabhängige Kirche gegenüber der BNZ als neuer Mission hin.*" (This difference of opinion among indigenous teachers points to the weakness of the HKBP as an independent church in relationship to the BNZ as a new Mission.) At the same time the HKBP itself planned to form a "HKBP School Association" for administering its schools and to bring this agreement to fruition, but this plan had not yet been realized when the Japanese arrived in 1942.

### **Fout! Bladwijzer niet gedefinieerd.**

The HKBP's negative feelings towards the BNZ were not only mused by the latter's prohibition for its teachers to serve congregations, but also by the BNZ's opening of a Pastors' School in the Sipoholon seminary complex for teacher candidates from Nias, Mentawai, Karo and the Methodist Church, but not from the HKBP as formerly, and in addition, because the BNZ had expropriated the Sipoholon seminary. In 1941, the BNZ's action forced the HKBP to operate its own seminary in Balige (which was also called the *Sikola Porhanger*), but there was no opportunity to graduate any students because of the coming of the Japanese forces the following year.

### ***The RMG Reaction***

What were the reactions and comments of the RMG leaders about all the developments mentioned? First of all, it must be noted that the RMG did not receive sufficient information about developments occurring after May 10, 1940 because of the rupture of communications between Germany and the Dutch Indies. With reference to the Special Synod of July 10-11, 1940 specifically, the RMG did not receive the official minutes. What it received was just a report from a Dutch pastor or a BNZ missionary who was assumed to have been Gramberg (see note 4) and Gramberg's paper about the HKBP's developments after the internment of German missionaries. The RMG gave its reaction on the basis of those two writings. In terms of the Batak church and community's spontaneous reaction to the fate which had befallen the RMG in the Batak area, it expressed its deepest feelings of bitterness. The RMG could not understand how the HKBP could proclaim itself an independent church without regard to the RMG, without expressing even a few words of thanks for its ministry and without taking proper steps to effect the separation. Its feelings were even more bitter when it read that the "radical group" in the Special Synod had laid claim to ownership of all RMG property in the Batak area without buying it with money from the Batak Christian community, and even including schools subsidized by the government whose funds for most of the construction originated from subsidies from the colonial government to the RMG and not to the HKBP. So offended were the RMG leaders about the claim, that one of them, Dr. J.

**Fout! Bladwijzer niet gedefinieerd.**

Winkler, a former missionary there named the synod "a Thieves' Synod" (*Räubersynode*).

The RMG did not give much comment about the actions of the Dutch colonial government to intern German churchmen; apparently that action was understandable as a consequence of the politics of Germany's involvement in World War II. But with reference to the actions taken by Dutch missionaries (De Kleine and colleagues), namely requesting assistance from the Mission Consulate to continue administering the work and property of the RMG, the latter expressed its feelings of gratitude and agreement. From the actions of De Kleine and associates, the RMG saw that although politically Germany was an enemy of the Dutch, nevertheless at the church level there was continued cooperation between the two. In fact, for the RMG, the taking over of the work and property were steps to be greatly praised to save both "from the hands of radical Christian Bataks who knew nothing about gratitude".<sup>8</sup>

In reading about the process of the election and the choosing of HKBP leaders at that synod, the RMG concluded that actually most HKBP members continued to want missionaries to lead their work. While asking why a graduate of the HTS was not chosen to be *Voorzitter*, the RMG expressed its hope that at a certain time, it would be able to return to work in the Batakland. Apparently, the RMG did not know that one reason why the colonial government appointed the ZNB/BNZ to take over the work of the RMG was because it did not want the RMG to ever return to the Batak area in as much as its home country was an enemy of the Dutch nation.

Although in general the RMG supported the policy of the Mission Consulate and BNZ with reference to the continued administration of its educational work in the Batakland, nevertheless there were matters to which it was not in agreement. One of these strong disagreements centred on the judgment of the BNZ that the teacher's dual function "was the weakest base of the whole mission work" and the BNZ policy which forbade school teachers receiving a subsidy to serve congregations. According to the RMG, this judgment and policy demonstrated that the BNZ did

---

<sup>8</sup> Response of J. Winkler to the Special HKBP Synod Meeting of July 10-11, 1940.

## **Fout! Bladwijzer niet gedefinieerd.**

not understand the Batak church and its history.

The RMG also reminded the BNZ that the government never absolutely forbade the teacher's dual function, even though it had to be acknowledged that the regulations governing subsidies made it difficult for the teacher to fulfil both functions well. It was just the subsidy which opened the possibility for the RMG to expand its network of congregations and schools for almost a half century in the past; therefore its work was able to develop so rapidly. Because of that, the RMG considered that the BNZ policy did not support the work of Mission and Church. In fact, the policy caused the RMG to doubt whether the BNZ was a genuine mission board having the goal of advancing evangelism and church development, or it was merely an extension of the government's hand to administer the Mission schools in harmony with government policy. In short, in terms of the relationship between school and congregation, the RMG shared the same opinion as the HKBP that the unity of both must be defended as in former times.

We now return to the school situation of the former Batakmission. After the demise of the Batakmission in the middle of 1940 as noted above, the schools which had been under one roof, relatively speaking, came to be administered by three independent bodies: the BNZ administered subsidized schools for indigenous students, the HKBP administered non-subsidized schools for indigenous students, and the two school associations administered Dutch schools. But the situation did not continue long. In March, 1942, the Japanese forces occupied the Dutch Indies and interned all Dutch persons in the country, including the BNZ workers and the Dutch teachers in the Batakland.

### ***Developments During and After the Japanese Occupation***

During the Japanese period, all schools, including the non-subsidized ones administered by the HKBP, were forcibly taken over by the Japanese authorities to become government schools. Other institutions which had been under the care of the Mission for a long time, such as hospitals, trade school, printing establishments, were also taken over by the Japanese. With all schools required to

### **Fout! Bladwijzer niet gedefinieerd.**

be under the Japanese government, the principle of Christian education was wiped out and was substituted by the principle of moral education *a la Nippon*, such as worship of the emperor. In the eyes of the HKBP, the Japanese actions were a perversion of the message of the Bible and planted anti-Christian teachings which had the final goal of wiping out Christianity. From those who had been with the RMG, such as De Kleine who was also interned, the Japanese actions meant that "the Church would lose its influence over the youth. It would no longer be possible for the Church to teach Christian young people in a Christian way through instruction in the school".<sup>9</sup>

Faced with the Japanese actions, many Batak Christian teachers were not willing to teach; so too, many parents objected to sending their children to school, with consequences which can well be imagined. The government itself was not particularly interested in advancing education as evidenced by its closing of many schools (and churches) including the Sipoholon seminary, and transforming their buildings into warehouses, military barracks, etc. In brief, the coming of the Japanese ended the life of mission education in the Batakland, and education in general experienced drastic decline. Of course, here and there were some rather positive images of the behaviour and policies of a small part of the Japanese government apparatus toward schools and teachers<sup>10</sup>, but viewed as a whole picture, the field of education in the Batak area was very discouraging during the Japanese occupation.

During the physical revolution (1945-1949), the HKBP, meaning Ephorus J. Sihombing, investigated the possibility of recovering the status and activities of those schools remaining. Working with the *Majelis Pusat Pendidikan Kristen* (MPPK, Central Council of Christian Schools) in Jakarta, he persistently pressured the government to return all former mission schools, including Dutch schools and those taken over by the Japanese to the HKBP. At the same time in a letter

---

<sup>9</sup> H. de Kleine in *JB* 1951/1952, p. 20.

<sup>10</sup> K. Sidjabat, for example, related that although in general the Japanese authorities had no interest at all in schooling, nevertheless there were Japanese individuals who were very respectful of teachers; especially those who were Christians greatly honoured the Church and its ministers; see his *Mamulus Galumbang ni Lima Zaman*, unpublished autobiography in stencilled form, Tomok, 1977, pp. 71-77.

**Fout! Bladwijzer niet gedefinieerd.**

dated October 1, 1948, the RMG itself had specified that all its holdings in Sumatra, including schools built with government subsidies, should be turned over to the HKBP. Apparently, that decision was taken when the RMG could see that there would be no further opportunity for it to return and work in Sumatra in the same position as formerly.<sup>11</sup>

But until the 1950s, the HKBP's struggles and the RMG's decision above did not achieve the desired results.

In Müller-Krüger's report of his attendance at the HKBP's Synod Meeting in 1952 as an RMG delegate, he indicated that just eight of the 356 subsidized *Volksschool* of the former Batakmission had been returned to the HKBP. At the end of the Japanese period, the remaining 348 had their status changed to that of government schools and continued to be in the hands of the Republic of Indonesia. He also noted that in addition to those eight People's Schools, the HKBP administered 97 non-subsidized schools i.e. those which remained of some 200 Village Schools from pre-internment times, and also several junior and senior high schools in addition to the special schools for the educating of candidates for the office of pastor.<sup>12</sup>

This writer has not been successful in obtaining data and information about the subsequent effort and success of the HKBP from the 1950s to the present in acquiring the former Batakmission schools from the Indonesian government (if there is such data), i.e. those schools which had been previously transferred to the HKBP from the RMG.<sup>13</sup> Perhaps the HKBP had given some of them as a gift to the Indonesian government. In any case, it is known for certain that some of the former

---

<sup>11</sup> Müller-Krüger in *JB* 1948, p. 23 noted the effort of two Dutch former Batakmission missionaries, De Kleine and Bos, to ascertain the possibility of the RMG's working again in the Batak area after the Japanese surrender. But they saw that the anti-European feeling and attitude within the Batak community was so extensive that they concluded: "the entrance to the Batakland proper is closed as yet".

<sup>12</sup> Cf. *Jubileumsjahr 125 (1828-1953) RMG* (1953, a leaflet congratulating the RMG and expressing the HKBP's appreciation for the RMG's work), p. 6: Of the 548 schools appropriated by the Japanese, there were still 455 which had not been returned to the HKBP after the revolution was ended.

<sup>13</sup> At the writer's visit to the HKBP's central office in Pearaja, August 23, 1986, the staff of HKBP's Department of Schools was unable to inform how many former Batakmission schools the Indonesian government had returned, and how many continued to be administered by the government.

**Fout! Bladwijzer niet gedefinieerd.**

Batakmission schools continue to be administered by the Indonesian government as this writer saw for himself when he did field research during August and September 1986.<sup>14</sup> In addition, there were many which have just disappeared and others, such as the Narumonda seminary, whose grounds have been used by institutions other than the HKBP.

But it must also be noted that between the 1950s and 1980s, the HKBP had succeeded in constructing many new schools from the kindergarten to the university.<sup>15</sup> For that purpose, the HKBP obtained major support and funds from its own congregations and in addition received a significant amount of assistance and funds from the RMG after the HKBP's 1950 Synod agreed to the restoration of a cooperative relationship between itself and the RMG.

From a cursory look at the data about the development of the HKBP's educational ministry since independence, we may get the impression that the HKBP has endeavoured to maintain the development of its educational or school work. But it is unclear whether the HKBP intends to restore the 'glory' of the Batakmission's former educational work, and the extent to which it wishes to build its educational system on the strong foundation laid by the Batakmission earlier.

---

<sup>14</sup> For example, the former Laguboti Trade School (*Ambachtschool*) continues to be a state technical school; the former Sigompulon HIS has now become a state senior highschool (SMA), and the former HIS at Narumonda has become the *Karya* Junior Highschool, a private school, and the grounds of several others are being used for state elementary schools.

<sup>15</sup> According to the "List of the Names of the HKBP Schools" in *the Almanak HKBP 1987*, pp. 251-256, schools under the aegis of the HKBP's Department of Schools are as follows: 8 kindergarten, 54 elementary schools, 46 junior high schools, 13 senior high schools and 2 vocational schools. In addition there are also institutions for the educating of church workers: The Higher Theological College at Pematang Siantar, Church Teachers' School at Sipoholon, the *Sikola Bijbelvrouw* at Laguboti, the Deaconess School at Balige and the Pastors' School at Sipoholon; there are also the Nommensen Universities in Medan and Pematang Siantar.