Dear Dr. Kennedy,

I have read the report published in the 'Herald Tribune' of Monday, January 12 concerning my comments on the Report to the World Council of Churches by Dr. Visser t'Hooft on his visit to the churches in South Africa.

The respects in which, to my mind, the report are unsatisfactory are as follows:

1. It creates the impression that I was unaware of the fact that the Report under review was one to, ahem, 'overby the World Council of Churches, a distinction which I took special pains to draw during the interview. It would obviously be unfair to attribute to the World Council the views of Dr. Visser t'Hooft who himself stated specifically on the first page of his report that he is solely responsible for the views expressed in it. Headings like 'Hits World Council's African Report', or 'Calls Churches' Inquiry into Apartheid 'Appeasement' do the World Council an injustice especially when we do not know the results of the deliberation of the World Council on the Visser t'Hooft report.

2. Although I was critical of the tone of the report, I must say that the expression "pussyfooting" is not the payttofonglimited vocabulary.

3. The last two paragraphs of the interview as published really have nothing to do with my views on the Visser t'Hooft report, and I cannot see what point, if any, they were intended to add to my comments.

4. If this report had been read over to me before it was published, as I suggested should be done, I should certainly have called for amendments along the lines indicated above. Describing me as a 'theologian' is an inaccuracy which I would not have allowed to pass unchallenged.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]